FOOD SOVEREIGNTY IN CANADA: EMERGING ACTORS AND COMPETING IDEAS IN NATIONAL AGRI-FOOD POLICYMAKING

by

Michelle Metzger

BKI, University of Waterloo, 2013

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN BRITISH COLUMBIA

December 2017

Abstract

Food sovereignty has recently gained increasing prominence as an alternative framework for agri-food policymaking. In Canada, food sovereignty actors are engaging with domestic agri-food policy issues; yet their activities targeting national policymaking have not been subject to systematic study. My research seeks to fill this gap by explaining food sovereignty actors' engagement in, and efforts to influence, federal policymaking processes. Using a case study research design that examines the period between 2009 and 2015, I demonstrate how Canadian food sovereignty actors have interacted with the federal policymaking process by initiating public debate over agri-food policy and forming strategic alliances with agri-food policymaking stakeholders. Furthermore, I show how food sovereignty actors promote ideas about autonomy and public engagement in federal policymaking, and explain the significance of these ideas compared to existing theories of agri-food policymaking in Canada.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

AAFC	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
APF	Agricultural Policy Framework
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CAPI	Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute
CBOC	Conference Board of Canada
CFA	Canadian Federation of Agriculture
CFIA	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
CWB	Canadian Wheat Board
EU	European Union
FSC	Food Secure Canada
HCSCAAF	House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food
IP	Intellectual Property
KTT	Kitchen Table Talks
LVC	*La Via Campesina*
MP	Member of Parliament
NDP	New Democratic Party of Canada
NFU	National Farmers Union
PBR	Plant Breeders Rights Act

PFPP	People's Food Policy Project
PM	Prime Minister
REB	Research Ethics Board
SSCAF	Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry
UNBC	University of Northern British Columbia
UP	*Union Paysanne*
UPOV	International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants
WTO	World Trade Organization

Acknowledgements

Countless people have provided me with all measures of support over the course of writing this thesis. My deepest love and gratitude goes to my family and friends – my parents Irene and Keith, brothers Philip and Steven, sister-in-law Bethany, my precious nephews Isaac and Eli, the Gillett family, the Brown family, the Tchouadang family, and my extended family of remarkable friends – whose care, encouragement, and good humour sustained me through many challenges. I thank God for placing these people in my life, for lifting me up, and walking alongside.

I would also like to acknowledge my mentors, counsellors, supervisors, colleagues, and friends at the Academic Success Centre, UNBC Wellness Centre, First Nations Centre, First Baptist Church, and Pioneer Park Christian Fellowship. Thanks also to my colleagues and friends in the INTS, Development Economics, and NRES programs for their camaraderie. A special thanks to my friend Ruth Wright-Gedcke for generously helping out with my French skills, and to my professors at UNBC – Dr. MacPhail, Dr. Bowles, and Dr. Murphy – for their instruction and mentorship.

Finally, I am deeply grateful for the skilful direction and support of my supervisor, Dr. Matias Margulis, who has been exceptionally dedicated and patient in guiding me through each stage of the research process. I am also grateful to my co-supervisor, Dr. David Connell, and committee member, Dr. Gregory Cameron, who took a keen interest in my research, providing insightful comments and mentorship along the way. Other resources were significant to my success; the UNBC Office of Research and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada provided funding for my research.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Development of the Argument

Canadians are becoming increasingly aware of multiple social, environmental, and health concerns about food (Wittman et al., 2010). These concerns include the negative health implications of high-fat, high-calorie diets (Engler-Stringer, 2011); environmental degradation and greenhouse gas emissions from industrial farming practices and food transport (Wiebe & Wipf, 2011); the declining profitability of small family farms (Qualman, 2011); and the lack of access and affordability of nutritious food, especially in poor urban and remote communities (Engler-Stringer, 2011; FSC, 2015j; FSC, 2015h). As one response to these growing concerns about food, individuals and communities across Canada have organized to promote food justice through community-level initiatives, such as farmers markets, community gardening, and anti-hunger programmes (Mansfield & Mendes, 2013).[1] Notably, a diverse network of actors and groups in Canada has organized around the idea of food sovereignty: a participatory and rights-based policy framework focused on principles of health, equity, and sustainability (Martin & Andrée, 2014).[2]

Currently, food sovereignty actors in Canada are advancing their ideas through both 'bottom-up' civil society based projects and 'top-down' policymaking processes[3] at municipal, provincial, and federal levels. In this study, I use the term food sovereignty actors to mean individuals and organizations that publicly advocate for food sovereignty as a framework and goal for agri-food policymaking in Canada. At the local scale, the policy influence of food sovereignty actors is visible through municipal food charters and food policy councils in municipalities across

---

[1] For more information on the evolution of the food movement in Canada, see Martin and Andrée (2014).
[2] Food sovereignty is defined explicitly on page 6 of this thesis.
[3] Policymaking is defined on page 22 of this thesis.

Canada, including Vancouver, Saskatoon, Sudbury, Waterloo, and Toronto.[4] At the provincial level, the influence of food sovereignty actors' ideas is arguably most evident in public policies such as Quebec's food sovereignty law, *La Politique Souveraineté Alimentaire*, which came into effect in 2013 (MAPAQ, 2013).[5] At the national level, food sovereignty actors such as the National Farmers Union (NFU) and Food Secure Canada (FSC) are seeking to influence federal agri-food legislation (NFU, n.d.; FSC, 2015b) and promoting a national food policy for Canada (FSC, 2011b). These examples illustrate the growing role of food sovereignty actors as stakeholders and participants in agri-food policymaking at multiple scales in Canada.

The critical importance of ideas in policymaking processes is well documented in the literature (Hall, 1993; Béland, 2005; Huitema et al., 2011; Cox & Béland, 2013; Baumgartner, 2013). Yet, despite the increased presence of food sovereignty actors in agri-food policy debates in Canada more broadly, there is a lack of scholarly literature that has systemically analysed these actors' engagement at the federal level and the implications of their advocacy of the idea of food sovereignty for how we understand the contemporary policy dynamics of agri-food policymaking in Canada. As I discuss in greater detail in the literature review, there is a lack of dialogue between scholars of the food sovereignty movement in Canada and scholars of the role of ideas in agri-food policymaking in Canada. As a result, the food sovereignty literature has not studied the food sovereignty movement's role as an actor in Canadian policymaking whereas, on the other hand, scholarship of agri-food policy has overlooked the emerging role of food

---

[4] A food charter is a non-binding community agreement, usually endorsed by a municipal government, which outlines the community's values and priorities with respect to food. The role of a food policy council is to "engage and educate among a broad range of... institutions on... the development of sustainable food systems" (Schiff, 2008).
[5] It is noteworthy, however, that agri-food policy actors in Quebec disagree on the application of the food sovereignty concept in this law (Union Paysanne, 2009). I discuss debates over various definitions and interpretations of the food sovereignty concept on pages 5-6 of this thesis.

sovereignty actors in the federal policymaking arena and the ideas they seek to insert into agri-food policy debates.

Research Design and Methods

The objective of my research is to address the gap in existing scholarship by providing a systemic study of the involvement of food sovereignty actors in Canadian federal agri-food policymaking. In particular, my research provides new data on food sovereignty actors' strategies of policy engagement at the federal level and maps the ideas they are bringing to bare in Canadian agri-food policymaking. This research, therefore, seeks to answer the following questions:

- What strategies do food sovereignty actors employ to engage in federal agri-food policymaking processes?
- How do food sovereignty actors seek to influence Canadian federal agri-food policymaking ideas?

The research undertaken was based on a multiple case study and exploratory research design, drawing on evidence from multiple sources, including documents and semi-structured interviews.

Chapter Outline

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 of this thesis reviews the food sovereignty and Canadian agri-food policy literature. I show the lack of analyses concerning interactions of food sovereignty actors with federal agri-food policymakers and policymaking processes. Chapter 3 explains the research methodology used to conduct the research. Chapters 4 and 5 present the empirical findings of the research, with each chapter dedicated to answering one of my research questions. In Chapter 4, I identify food sovereignty actors' primary strategies of engagement

with policymaking processes in two case studies (debates over a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act). In Chapter 5, I analyse the specific ideas raised by food sovereignty actors in the two case studies, and explain the significance of food sovereignty ideas in federal agri-food policymaking. In Chapter 6, I state the conclusions and limitations of this research and propose opportunities for future study.

Contribution of this Research

The key contribution of my research is that it provides new empirical knowledge about how food sovereignty actors strategically engage in federal policymaking in Canada and how food sovereignty actors seek to influence agri-food policymaking ideas. The findings enrich the literature on agri-food policy and food sovereignty, providing both direct insight on how food sovereignty actors are engaging in public policy and to what extent food sovereignty actors are contesting the dominant paradigms that shape Canadian agri-food policymaking. Furthermore, the findings show how food sovereignty actors advocate selected ideas from the transnational food sovereignty movement when engaging in Canadian agri-food policymaking processes. My research provides the foundation for further research into the nature and potential influence of the food sovereignty movement on public policy in Canada.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

I first review the social movement literature with respect to food sovereignty in Canada. The literature on food sovereignty provides a theoretical and applied definition of food sovereignty, notwithstanding ongoing discussion of the trade-off between the clarity and inclusivity of the food sovereignty concept (Beuchelt & Virchow, 2012; Martin & Andrée, 2014; Hopma & Woods, 2014). The food sovereignty literature also identifies key national food sovereignty actors in the Canadian context, but does not systematically evaluate the engagement of food sovereignty actors in federal agri-food policymaking processes.

I then review the public policy literature on policy paradigms concerning Canadian agri-food policy. The public policy literature is critical for understanding the role of ideas in shaping Canadian agri-food policy. In particular, the concept of policy paradigms has been employed to understand and differentiate three competing ideational approaches to federal agri-food policymaking in Canada: market liberalism, state assistance, and multi-functionality. Yet, this debate over competing ideas in policymaking has not included food sovereignty, despite growing evidence of food sovereignty actors' engagement in policymaking processes.

Food Sovereignty

The food sovereignty concept was introduced in the 1990s by the South American peasant movement *La Via Campesina* (translated as 'the peasant's way') in reaction to neoliberal development policies, such as structural adjustment in the 1980s and agricultural trade liberalization under the World Trade Organization's 1995 *Agreement on Agriculture* (Wittman et al., 2010; Beuchelt & Virchow, 2012; McKay et al., 2014). Through *La Via Campesina*, smallholder farmers have organized in solidarity efforts to resist neoliberal policies and the negative consequences of these on their livelihoods (Desmarais, 2008; McKeon, 2009; Martinez-

Torres & Rosset, 2010; Edelman et al., 2014). Food sovereignty has since spurred a diverse, transnational social movement that represents approximately 200 million farmers in 73 countries and continues to resist neoliberal agricultural development (La Via Campesina, n.d.).

La Via Campesina defines food sovereignty as "the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems" (Nyéléni, 2007). The framing of this definition is important, since specific choices in language and ideas have been shown to have considerable influence over the direction and outcomes of social movements (Fairbairn, 2010). By advocating for changes in both individual behaviors of farmers and the state via public policy reform, *La Via Campesina* promotes food sovereignty as a way of organizing food systems that decentralizes power through democratic processes and by prioritizing ecologically sustainable agricultural practices as alternative to the dominant paradigm of industrial agriculture (Iles & Montenegro de Wit, 2014). In addition to developing and practicing democratic processes in their own organization, *La Via Campesina* promotes democratic decision-making in agri-food policy at multiple scales in order for small-holder farmers to maintain decentralized control and access to agricultural resources (Wittman et al., 2010). Furthermore, the food sovereignty concept "recognizes the transformative possibilities of community empowerment in democratic processes of economic and social decision making" (Andrée et al., 2014, p. 12). In other words, from a food sovereignty perspective, democratic decision-making carries significance for both resource allocations in the agri-food sector as well as broader notions of social wellbeing associated with participation in policymaking. In addition, the transnational food sovereignty movement promotes economic, gender, and social equality in all aspects of food, ranging from production to consumption (Wittman et al., 2010).

Since the 1990s, the food sovereignty concept has been mainstreamed and increasingly institutionalized in local, national, and international policymaking arenas. Local food sovereignty policies are widespread, and examples from Canada are discussed in detail in the next section. Multiple states, including Bolivia, Ecuador, Mali, Nepal, Nicaragua, Senegal, and Venezuela, have incorporated food sovereignty in their national constitutions or other legislation (Beauregard, 2009; Beuchelt & Virchow, 2012; Schiavoni, 2015). At the global level, The United Nations Committee on World Food Security has, since 2009, created formal spaces for civil society groups, such as the transnational food sovereignty movement, to participate in shaping global debates about agriculture and food policy (McKeon, 2009; Schiavoni, 2014; Metzger, 2015).

The broad definition of food sovereignty has fueled significant controversy in the literature and among practitioners (McKay et al., 2014). Some consider the breadth of food sovereignty an asset, as this provides a framework for diverse communities of food producers and consumers to address many distinct, yet interconnected social, political, environmental, and economic justice issues at local and global scales (Wittman et al., 2010; Fairbairn, 2010; Viser, 2015; Martin & Andrée, 2014). Others, such Hopma and Woods (2014), Beuchelt and Virchow (2012), and McKay et al. (2014), highlight challenges to the integrity of the food sovereignty concept by such flexibility, suggesting the need for further conceptualization to reconcile 'internal tensions and ambiguity' within food sovereignty. The use of 'sovereignty' language is highlighted as problematic, as it may 'imply the empowerment of individuals, communities, and nations' (Hopma & Woods, 2014; Beuchelt & Virchow, 2012). Yet, Schiavoni (2015), Iles, and Montenegro de Wit (2014) see inherent value in reframing the sovereignty concept to reflect multiple, negotiable positions of power. Indeed, the debate over 'multiple sovereignties' underscores the difficult relationship between food sovereignty actors and national governments (Schiavoni, 2014; McKay et al., 2014). Studies of national policies in Latin America suggest that

food sovereignty carries a "contradictory notion of sovereignty, requiring simultaneously a strong developmentalist state and the redistribution of power to facilitate direct control over food systems in ways that may threaten the state" (McKay et al., 2014, p. 1175). In other words, food sovereignty actors seek to leverage government authority as a means of protecting individual autonomy over personal food choices and localized decision-making for agri-food activities.

The potential for conflicting interests between food producers, consumers, and the state presents a major challenge for food sovereignty actors in achieving their goals through national policymaking. Food sovereignty goals may actually involve substantial institutional reforms in order for governments to accommodate more localized decision-making structures. McKay et al. suggest,

> if food sovereignty is to be about the ability of 'local' peoples to have a say in defining, managing and controlling their own food and agricultural systems, then state efforts to support food sovereignty must involve some degree of structural reform to distribute power in ways that facilitate such local autonomy… But this shifting distribution of power is necessarily shot through with conflicts and tensions, as actors across the state-society terrain interpret food sovereignty goals differently and place them against other priorities (2014, p. 1177).

This type of institutional change has been effective in the case of Venezuela, where the inclusion of food sovereignty in Venezuela's national constitution resulted in the restructuring and decentralization of certain governance systems (McKay et al., 2014). Meanwhile, national food sovereignty experiments in Bolivia and Ecuador have resulted in rhetorical change only (McKay et al., 2014). The literature suggests that governments' adoption of food sovereignty rhetoric without the accompanying institutional reform may actually threaten the 'integrity and original essence' of food sovereignty (Schiavoni, 2014; Schiavoni, 2015; Godek, 2013).

Despite concerns around clarity, the literature suggests that food sovereignty movements are united by the overarching principles identified by *La Via Campesina* and shaped by the contexts in which they evolve (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014). Food sovereignty scholars tend to accept the flexible definition of food sovereignty while calling for scholarly research to unpack the many applications of food sovereignty in practice and investigate the threads of connectivity between them (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014; Shawki, 2015). Specifically, further research is required to fully understand the emergence and application of food sovereignty in the context of national agri-food policymaking.

Food sovereignty actors in the Canadian context

Food sovereignty in Canada manifests itself in a unique way. In the Canadian context, the literature identifies three key groups that form the core national food sovereignty actors. These include farmers groups, consumer groups, and First Nations (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014).

The key farmers group promoting food sovereignty at the national level is the National Farmers Union (NFU) of Canada. The NFU was among the founding members of *La Via Campesina* and certain NFU members have been recognized for helping build the capacity of *La Via Campesina* as a transnational food sovereignty movement (NFU, 2016). The NFU is Canada's "largest voluntary direct-membership national farm organization" (Beingessner, 2011). Its primary goal is to support agri-food policies that "ensure dignity and security of income for farm families while enhancing the land for future generations" (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014, p. 6). The NFU is concerned that Canadian agri-food policy is increasingly reflecting a competitive and industrial agricultural model, in which farmers are encouraged to be 'self-reliant and market-responsive' (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014). The NFU views market pressures and increasing concentration of the agri-businesses sector as directly threatening to traditional small-scale farming practices, and responds to these pressures by championing a food sovereignty

perspective, in particular advocating for the collective voice of small-scale farmers at the national level (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014; Beingessner, 2011).

Research shows the NFU has lobbied the federal government to support agriculture policies it views as benefiting its members, the majority of who are small family farmers. The NFU has been a vocal supporter of the continuation of 'farmer-controlled, collective marketing' through the Canadian Wheat Board (CWB) and maintaining supply management practices in the dairy, eggs, and poultry sectors, in the face of increasing domestic and international free-market pressures and trade negotiations concerning agriculture (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014; NFU, 2015c). The NFU also advocated for multiple legislative changes within the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) of 2015, particularly in opposition to increased intellectual property rights for multinational seed companies operating in Canada (National Farmers Union, n.d.). The NFU's efforts to influence agri-food policymaking have been met with varied success. The CWB underwent significant restructuring in 2011, while the position of supply management in federal policymaking remains strong, despite continued pressure from both Canadian agri-food stakeholders and international trading partners to include Canadian supply-managed sectors in free-trade agreements.[6] The literature on food sovereignty in Canada suggests that these policy debates encompass important social and environmental justice issues, reflecting farmers' concerns over their position of power to influence the politics of agriculture.

The literature identifies consumers as the second major group of national food sovereignty actors in Canada, and Food Secure Canada (FSC) is the leading consumer group promoting food sovereignty at the national scale. Established in 2006, FSC is a national network consisting of

---

[6] In particular, the NFU took a strong position to advocate for the continuation of supply management during international trade negotiations related to the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the European Union's member states. For more detail on this particular issue see (NFU, 2014e).

"local and regional non-profit, charitable, and consumer-based organizations" (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014). FSC members are both ideologically and functionally diverse; however, FSC suggests that its members are united by mutual respect for one another's efforts to address a wide range of interconnected issues related to food and agriculture (Kneen, 2011). FSC states its mission is "to create a coherent food movement in Canada that could strengthen local projects and support a national food policy for a just and sustainable food system" (Kneen, 2011, p. 80). This mandate enables FSC to unite members engaged with policymaking processes at multiple scales. It has been argued that FSC's leadership in municipal policymaking has resulted in public support for a wide variety of community-food programs. For example, Mansfield and Mendes report that

> a growing number of cities across the global north are devising policy responses to food security and food system issues that align with municipal roles and responsibilities. Local government responses include food charters, urban farms, community gardens, farmers' markets, backyard hens, hobby beekeeping, community fruit tree orchards, community kitchens, anti-hunger programmes, food waste diversion programmes and food policy councils (2013, p. 38).

Food sovereignty actors' advocacy and influence with respect to local policymaking and developing community food programs in partnership with municipal governments in Canada is well documented in the food sovereignty literature (Schiff, 2008; Koç et al., 2008; Mansfield & Mendes, 2013; Martin & Andrée, 2014).

FSC has also become active at the national level. In 2009, FSC undertook a countrywide campaign proposing a national food sovereignty policy. This campaign policy drew on the input of 3500 Canadian citizens and groups and made several recommendations to national political parties and federal policymakers on how Canadian agri-food policy could better support local, ecologically sustainable, and affordable food (Andrée et al., 2011; Desmarais & Wittman, 2014).

By promoting a national food policy among federal policymakers, FSC intends to complement municipal and community-based food policies and programs by also supporting localized solutions to food-related problems from the top-down. FSC has emerged as a leading organization and unifying network for the food sovereignty movement in Canada. FSC has been shown to enable a broad spectrum of localized organizations to develop a vision of, and promote, food sovereignty as an alternative approach for Canadian agri-food policymaking (Andrée et al., 2011; Desmarais & Wittman, 2014).

Thirdly, the literature identifies First Nations communities as a key food sovereignty actor in Canada. Indigenous communities in Canada experience severe problems concerning food access, nutrition, and public health (Willows et al., 2008). Food is also a more complex concept for Indigenous people than for non-Indigenous farmers and consumers because of the deeply rooted significance of traditional food practices for Indigenous culture, identity, and spirituality (Power, 2008). The concept of sovereignty for Indigenous groups in Canada also has a unique meaning, concerning whether the Western idea of sovereignty "reflects indigenous self-determination and the relationship between autonomy and respectful interdependency between communities" (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014). Whereas food sovereignty in general recognizes "social, cultural and economic relationships," in Indigenous food sovereignty, these relationships are also considered in the context of "inter-community food sharing and trading as a mechanism for indigenous health and well-being" (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014, p. 13). The literature is less clear on what specific groups are the key proponents of, or spokespeople for, Indigenous food sovereignty in Canada. For example, the literature references an active Indigenous Circle working with and through FSC to represent the voice of Indigenous peoples in FSC's activities and policy engagement; however, there is limited academic research on the specific Indigenous persons or communities involved, and what their policy goals and outcomes have been.

The discussion has thus far presented food sovereignty as a concept and transnational social movement, and provided context for how this manifests itself in Canada. In particular, the academic research on food sovereignty in Canada has been largely approached through a social movement lens, seeking to understand how the movement and its members are organized. However, missing from the literature is a systematic analysis of food sovereignty actors' interactions with federal policymakers in light of longstanding research on competing policy ideas in Canadian agri-food policy. This link is significant so as to better understand how food sovereignty actors might be influencing Canadian federal agri-food policymaking processes and ideas through their targeted engagement efforts.

Policy Paradigms and Agri-Food Policy

In this section, I review the public policy literature on Canadian agri-food policy. Given the importance of the policy paradigm concept in this body of scholarship, I first discuss policy paradigms before examining its scholarly application to Canadian agri-good policy.

Public policy scholars use policy paradigms to examine how ideas influence policymaking processes (Hall, 1993; Skogstad, 1998; Abaidoo & Dickinson, 2002; Béland, 2005; Princen & Hart, 2014; Daigneault, 2014). Peter Hall first introduced the policy paradigm concept in his 1993 article on social learning in British economic policymaking. As Hall puzzles through the role of ideas in policymaking and policy change, he observes that policymaking takes place in a 'realm of discourse' or an 'interpretive framework,' which he calls a policy paradigm. According to Hall, policy paradigms capture various overlapping and competing "frameworks of ideas and standards that specify not only the *goals* of policy and the *kinds of instruments* that can be used to attain them, but also the very *nature of the problems* they are meant to be addressing" (1993, p. 279, emphasis added). Furthermore Hall claims, "this framework is embedded in the very terminology through which policymakers communicate about their work, and it is influential

precisely because so much of it is taken for granted and unamenable to scrutiny as a whole" (1993, p. 279). Therefore, a policy paradigm makes explicit the nature of the context in question, how it ought to be observed, which goals might be attainable, the instruments that might be necessary, and finally the 'prism' or lens through which policymakers view the world and their role therein (Hall, 1993). In other words, each policy paradigm "contains its own account of how the world facing policymakers operates, and each account is different" (Hall, 1993, p. 280). As a result, policy paradigms have enabled scholars and policy professionals alike to broadly categorize differing worldviews and ideational approaches that may impact the direction of policymaking on a particular issue.

Since Hall's initial intervention, scholars have debated how the policy paradigm framework should be applied and refined. For example, Daigneault argues that Hall's policy paradigm concept is 'underspecified and insufficiently operationalized' leading, in some cases, to the misuse of the policy paradigm concept in the literature (2014). Daigneault, therefore, builds on Hall's framework to more clearly distinguish between the 'ideas of policymakers' (i.e. policy paradigms) and 'the policies they adopt' (2014). He then suggests several guidelines to further clarify and direct the application of the policy paradigm concept (Daigneault, 2014). These include an emphasis on: the normative and cognitive ideas held by policymakers; four key attributes signifying key policy ideas, issues, interests, and institutions; and the importance of using 'direct evidence of policy actors' ideas and beliefs' in studying policy paradigms (Daigneault, 2014). While the debate continues concerning how to avoid conflating the concrete (policy) with the ideational (paradigm) elements of policymaking, there is consensus in the literature that Daigneault's "separation between paradigms and policies… is particularly important if we are to study systematically the role of ideas in policymaking" (Princen & Hart, 2014, p. 470). In the midst of ongoing debates over the application of policy paradigms, the policy paradigm concept has been generally accepted as a helpful tool for public policy scholars.

The policy paradigm approach is widely applied to the study of agri-food policymaking. Cases include the promotion of various agri-food development strategies in the global south (Byerlee et al., 2009; de Janvry, 2010), explaining agricultural policy change in the United States, Canada, and Australia (Coleman et al., 1997; Coleman, 2001; Skogstad, 2008a), and regional or international agricultural policy evolution in the European Union (EU) and at the World Trade Organization (WTO) (Potter & Lobley, 2004; Petrick, 2008; Dibden et al., 2009; Feindt, 2010). For example, policy paradigms have been used to analyse how the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has evolved over time to reflect a multi-functional framework (Renting et al., 2009; Dibden et al., 2009; Feindt, 2010), while Australian agri-food policy has shifted towards a free market framework in recent decades (Dibden et al., 2009; Coleman et al., 1997). Policy paradigms are also used to document and explain struggles between competing policy ideas. For example, policy paradigms are used to study how contests between competing paradigms at the WTO have contributed to the stalemated Doha Round trade negotiations on agriculture (Skogstad, 2007; Dibden et al., 2009).

In the Canadian context, the analysis of agri-food policy focuses on the ongoing contest between three key policy paradigms (Skogstad, 2012). These three policy paradigms are: state assistance, market liberalism, and multi-functionality (Skogstad, 2008a). Firstly, the policy paradigm of state assistance reflects a policy approach centered on significant state involvement in agriculture, supported by underlying assumptions about the exceptional nature of agriculture as a vulnerable economic sector and food production as an issue of national security (Potter & Lobely, 2004; Potter & Tilzey, 2005; Skogstad, 2008a). Skogstad observes that since the mid-1900s the state assistance paradigm has largely characterized Canadian food and agriculture policy. This is exemplified by 1) the historic dominance of agriculture as a staple for Canadian economic development, 2) the precedent of providing significant government support during the Great Depression due to agriculture's structural disadvantage in the market economy, and 3)

state investment to maximize the productivity and profitability of the agriculture sector in the post-war period (Skogstad, 2007). An enduring pillar of the state assistance paradigm is Canada's supply management system in the dairy, eggs, and poultry sectors. It is noteworthy that Canadian policies of state assistance have been contested over the years, driven by strong regional differences both in farming practice and ideology. For example, many Canadian producers, such as large-scale grain farmers in western Canada, rely heavily on access to export markets and thus disagree with the principles of state assistance (Skogstad, 2008a). Nevertheless, state assistance remained the dominant paradigm for Canadian agri-food policy until late in the 20th century (Skogstad, 2008a).

The second policy paradigm that influences Canadian agri-food policy is the market liberal (or neoliberal) paradigm. This paradigm is characterized by a preference for less state intervention in favour of a free-market policy approach (Potter & Tilzey, 2005; Skogstad, 2008a; Fairbairn, 2010). Beginning in the 1980s, changes in the global economic environment prompted a shift in Canada from an emphasis on state-assistance to liberalization and deregulation in Canadian agri-food policy. A competitiveness approach in Canadian policy has placed increasing emphasis on expanding global markets for Canadian exports, technological advancement, and added value in agricultural products (Skogstad, 2007). Canada's participation in the World Trade Organization and the regional North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the United States and Mexico are major drivers of this shift towards neoliberalism in agri-food policy (Skogstad, 2008a). Furthermore, Skogstad identifies other related trends, such as greater industrialization, concentration in farm sizes, and increased mechanization (Skogstad, 2008b). On the surface, these observations appear to align with many of the criticisms made by food sovereignty actors about Canadian agri-food policy discussed above. However, Skogstad claims that market-liberal pressures in Canadian agriculture have resulted in *programmatic* change rather than *paradigmatic* change in policymaking (2008a), meaning that even though some policies have

emerged that promote competitiveness and a focus on international trade, these goals have not significantly diminished the activist role of the Canadian state in directly managing certain parts of the Canadian agri-food sector (Skogstad, 2008b; Skogstad 2012).

The third policy paradigm is the multi-functionality paradigm, which is characterized by explicit public support of environmental and social functions carried out by rural communities (Cocklin et al., 2006; Wilson, 2007; Wilson, 2010; Skogstad, 2012). Multi-functionality remains a topic of debate in the fields of public policy, human geography, and rural sociology as scholars explore how it relates to market liberal and state assistance policy approaches (Potter & Tilzey, 2005; Cocklin et al., 2006; Skogstad, 2012), and consider how different levels of multi-functionality can emerge across a 'spectrum of decision making' (Wilson, 2010; Skogstad, 2012). For example, proponents of market liberal trade policies criticize multi-functionality as a "disguised form of trade protection" (Dibden et al., 2009, p. 300) while advocates of multi-functional agriculture value the paradigm for protecting the role of "agriculture [in] its ability to supply public environmental goods and sustain social capital in rural areas" (Dibden et al., 2009, p. 300). Despite debate about the goals of multi-functionality, scholars tend to accept and apply the multi-functionality paradigm to a wide range of policymaking contexts where governments choose to compensate farmers and landowners for social and environmental services (Cocklin et al., 2006; Wilson, 2010; Skogstad, 2012).

Skogstad argues that the current situation in Canada is one of overlapping and competing policy ideas rather than one paradigm being dominant. This is exemplified in Skogstad's analyses of recent, federal agri-food policies, which simultaneously exhibit characteristics of the market liberal, state assistance, and multi-functionality paradigms. Skogstad observes that,

> Canadian Governments have resisted articulation of a single model for Canada. Instead, they have added goals and programs associated with the

> multifunctionality paradigm onto the state assistance paradigm, even while continuing to see their role as largely assisting farmers to become more competitive within a global liberalizing political economy (Skogstad, 2012, p. 33).

One case that illustrates how the three paradigms overlap is the 2002 Agricultural Policy Framework (APF)[7] that highlighted priorities associated with multi-functionality, such as "food safety and quality, environmental sustainability, and the promotion of regional interests and rural communities" (Skogstad, 2012, p. 27). When one examines the government's policy in practice, however, these broader goals have not proven to be a high priority when compared with the emphasis placed on international trade and business risk management programs, associated with the market liberal paradigm. At the same time, through the APF, the government maintained a substantial role in promoting both multi-functional goals and competitive market growth (Skogstad, 2012).

The overlapping and competing policy frameworks in agri-food policymaking in Canada are best understood in light of the actors or groups that hold corresponding ideas. According to Skogstad, the pluralism in Canadian agri-food policy reflects "the ideological and organizational pluralism of the Canadian farm lobby" (2008b, p. 44). In other words, the collective voice of Canadian farmers is fragmented by representation in numerous, competing farmers unions (Skogstad, 2008b). For example, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA) is considered to be the 'most credible voice' for farmers in Canada due to its broad membership and close relationship with the Ministry of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. The CFA frequently champions a free-market approach to Canadian agri-food policy; yet, it has failed to achieve a strong policy influence in Canada (Skogstad, 2008b). Neither have the NFU nor the many commodity-based

---

[7] The APF was replaced by subsequent agricultural policy frameworks, Growing Forward and Growing Forward 2 (AAFC, 2014).

farm organizations established strong influence in federal policymaking (Skogstad, 2008b). Furthermore, political parties have often interacted with a variety of agri-food actors in order to advance strategic national interests and gain political influence (Skogstad, 2008b). Historically, the Canadian government established the Canadian Dairy Commission and the Canadian Wheat Board to promote protectionist agriculture policies (Skogstad, 2008b). Today, these organizations continue to advocate for the value and continuation of supply management and single-desk marketing,[8] respectively, in the face of increasing free-market pressures. Each organization contributes to the complexity of Canadian agri-food policymaking in advocating its unique position and interests.

Other scholarship confirms Skogstad's thesis that multiple policy paradigms characterize the complexity of Canadian agri-food policymaking (Cohn, 2009; Hedley, 2009; Josling, 2010). While Hedley suggests the role of provincial actors in federal policymaking remains underdeveloped in Skogstad's analysis (2009), Josling agrees with Skogstad's assessment of regional tensions and their influence on national decision-making (2010).[9] Other studies of agriculture policy also align with Skogstad in highlighting the multiple overlapping priority areas in Canadian food and agriculture policies (MacRae, 2011).[10]

I suggest that the current literature on competing policy paradigms in Canadian agri-food policy is missing a key aspect – the increasing voice and engagement of food sovereignty actors (which Skogstad also recognized as a gap in her 2012 article). Even though the food sovereignty

---

[8] Since the Canadian Wheat Board was restructured in 2011, several past directors of the CWB continue their advocacy through the Canadian Wheat Board Alliance.

[9] Regional tensions among agri-food actors are many and varied. Examples include divided provincial farm groups across the country forming alliances with provincial governments to advance interests such as supply management in Ontario or access to grain transport in Saskatchewan and Alberta (Skogstad, 2008b).

[10] Specifically MacRae, like Skogstad, highlights the multiple goals of Canada's agricultural policy framework (APF) to combine business risk management and innovation objectives with broad environmental, health, and rural development interests (MacRae, 2011).

literature indicates that food sovereignty actors are increasingly engaging with Canadian policymaking processes (Koç et al., 2008; Desmarais & Wittman, 2014), the literature on agri-food policy has yet to seriously consider food sovereignty in discussions of competing ideas for Canadian agri-food policymaking.

Chapter Summary

This review has covered the literature on food sovereignty and agri-food policy in Canada, highlighting a common concern with the ongoing contest of ideas in Canadian policymaking. The social movement literature outlines how food sovereignty actors seek to shift the terms of the debate on federal agri-food policy in Canada. The public policy literature contains analyses of competing ideas in agri-food policy. Missing from both is a systematic analysis of food sovereignty actors' interactions with federal policymaking processes, including their particular policy goals and strategies they use to influence Canadian agri-food policymaking. The following chapter outlines the research method used to address this gap.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

In light of contested ideas in federal agri-food policymaking and the increasing engagement of food sovereignty actors in Canadian agri-food policymaking, the objective of my research is to identify and explain Canadian food sovereignty actors' national policy engagement strategies and potential influence with respect to key policymaking ideas. Specifically, my research builds on the existing food sovereignty and public policy literature by exploring how food sovereignty actors advance food sovereignty ideas in Canadian federal agri-food policymaking processes in light of the three established policy paradigms of state assistance, market liberalism, and multi-functionality. While the existing literature identifies key food sovereignty actors in Canada and explains their general goals from a social movement perspective, this existing work has not examined in detail Canadian food sovereignty actors' engagement with agri-food policymaking. Therefore, this research will answer the following questions:

- What strategies do food sovereignty actors employ to engage in federal agri-food policymaking processes?
- How do food sovereignty actors seek to influence Canadian federal agri-food policymaking ideas?

Defining Key Terms and Research Objectives

In this study I have selected to analyse the policy engagement activities of the National Farmers Union (NFU) and Food Secure Canada (FSC), both of which are established in the literature as key national organizations that publicly support food sovereignty. These organizations and their members will be the primary units of analysis in this investigation, and I will refer to them as

"food sovereignty actors."[11] Furthermore, I use the term engage to mean the act of participating, becoming involved in, or establishing meaningful contact or connection (Oxford, 2010) applied to food sovereignty actors' interaction with federal policymakers and in the context of Canadian policymaking processes. Examples of engagement may include letters to political representatives, presentations in parliamentary committees, and public campaigns to advance key ideas among Canadian voters. Finally, I use the term policymaking to mean the wide set of processes that result in formulating policy (Oxford, 2010). This definition is broader than approaches that only emphasize the technical aspects of policy formulation and implementation, to include processes such as general elections, debates, readings of bills in parliament, meetings of parliamentary committees, and voting in parliament, all of which influence how policy is made. Furthermore, policymaking processes always involve a complex social situation including a diverse set of actors operating in complex social, political, economic, and structural environments. Given these complex dynamics, Daigneault (2014) articulates four key attributes that scholars of policymaking should pay attention to: *ideas* influence how actors approach *issues*, rooted in their own *interests* (or the interests of those they represent) through the mechanisms of established *institutions*. Therefore, in this research I use the term policymaking processes to include competing, and overlapping ideas, issues, interests, and institutions that may influence policy formation.

The objectives of this research are to investigate the intent, strategy, and circumstances causing food sovereignty actors to focus on specific issues and target particular policymaking processes in their advocacy work. By generating a more precise account of what food sovereignty actors do to promote their ideas and interests, my goal is to contribute to a more detailed and dynamic

---

[11] The literature also identifies First Nations as a key category of national food sovereignty actors. However, I did not specifically study this group since engagement with First Nations communities would have required information, permission, and resources that were either not available or beyond the scope of this research project.

understanding of how the food sovereignty concept is practiced in Canadian agri-food policymaking. In addition, I expect that mapping out food sovereignty actors' specific activities in federal agri-food policymaking will generate insights into how these actors interact with federal policymakers and agri-food policy stakeholders in Canada. In particular, my findings seek to illuminate the similarities and differences between food sovereignty actors' ideas and those of established agri-food policy stakeholders. Documenting these specific engagement activities and the ideas they promote will be a preliminary step towards a future understanding of food sovereignty actors' degree of influence in the process of agri-food policymaking in Canada.

In sum, my study seeks to bridge existing research on the food sovereignty movement in Canada with the scholarship on Canadian agri-food policymaking.

Research Design: Logic and Criteria

This research uses an exploratory, case study research design. Case studies are a valid and reliable methodology for generating in-depth, 'concrete, practical, [and] context-dependent knowledge' (Flyberrg, 2006). Case studies are ideal for investigating contemporary events and can effectively address exploratory research questions with respect to an established framework of study (Yin, 2003). Accordingly, I use policy paradigms as framework of study, enabling the broad research questions – concerning the engagement of food sovereignty actors in policymaking – to be understood in terms of how these actors express or utilize particular issues, ideas, interests, and institutions. Furthermore, this research draws on multiple case studies, using replication logic to establish a degree of confidence in the findings when similar results are found across multiple cases (Yin, 2003).

Finally, case study research requires carefully selected cases. In this research, I selected exemplary cases, which "reflect strong, positive examples of the phenomenon of interest… [and allow me] to determine whether similar causal events – within each case – produce these positive

outcomes" (Yin, 2003, p. 12). Yin suggests selecting cases based on a screening procedure (2003). In turn, I screened for case studies by searching the official websites of the NFU and FSC for evidence of engagement in policymaking processes, such as letters written or presentations made to federal policymakers, or public campaigns concerning federal agri-food issues. These activities were found to focus on a few key areas of concern: policy changes around the Canadian Wheat Board; support for small-scale and new farmers; domestic food security for children and marginalized communities; advocacy with respect to the review and redesign of the Nutrition North program; the promotion of a national food policy; and concerns regarding the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18), such as changes to seed saving and intellectual property rights legislation. Cases were considered exemplary if they reflected: the concerns of a broad spectrum of food sovereignty actors; the interests of Canadians in all geographic regions; and different aspects of the federal policymaking apparatus. Appropriate cases also required sufficient, publicly available data. Based on the above process and criteria, two cases that were found to be the most feasible and applicable included: 1) the campaign for a National Food Policy and 2) the Agricultural Growth Act. The following section outlines these cases in more detail.

Selected Cases

My research investigates how food sovereignty actors engage with policymaking in an industrialized country with longstanding democratic institutions, a mature capitalist economy, and a highly productive agricultural base; this focus contrasts previous studies of food sovereignty in national policymaking in the global south (Schiavoni, 2015; Beauregard, 2009; McKay et al., 2014).

My research investigates two specific cases of food sovereignty actors' engagement with federal policymaking. The first case involves public debates over the development of a national food

policy for Canada. Federal political parties, think tanks, industrial farm groups, and food sovereignty actors alike have published national food policy proposals in recent years (CAPI, 2009; FSC, 2011a; MacRae, 2011; NDP, 2011; Conference Board of Canada, 2014; Canadian Federation of Agriculture, 2011). I focus on two major instances of food sovereignty actors' national policy engagement in advocating for a national food policy: 1) public promotion of FSC's People's Food Policy Project (PFPP) and its report *Resetting the Table: A People's Food Policy for Canada*, and 2) FSC's Eat Think Vote campaign during the general election of 2015. These projects represent key points of involvement for food sovereignty actors in policymaking, but have not been thoroughly studied in relation to ideas in Canadian agri-food policy. According to Hall, such an 'evolving societal debate' – involving a broad range of actors such as civil servants, officials, contending political parties, experts, members of the media, and civil society – is central for understanding how competing ideas and policy paradigms interact with policymaking processes (1993). Accordingly, to understand how ideas influence policy choices, scholars must investigate a broad discourse that includes not only policymakers and policy debates, but also a wide range of experts and stakeholders. The public debate over a national food policy in Canada is, therefore, a suitable case since it a) highlights an important component of the policymaking process and b) features key efforts of food sovereignty actors to advance their policy ideas and interests alongside political parties and a variety of other national agri-food policy actors.

For my second case, I examine debates within the Canadian Parliament in order to highlight how food sovereignty actors engage with formal legislative processes, including the House of Commons, Senate, and their respective standing committees. Specifically, I investigate debate surrounding the passing of the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) in the second session of the 41st parliament, which received royal assent and became law on February 25, 2015 (Parliament of Canada, 2015a). Bill C-18 was an omnibus bill containing amendments to: the Plant Breeders'

Rights Act; the Feeds Act; the Fertilizers Act; the Health of Animals Act; the Plant Protections Act; the Agri-food Administrative and Monetary Policies Act; and the Agricultural Marketing Programs Act (Parliament of Canada, 2015a). This case study permits the study of the NFU and FSC's engagement with parliamentary and public debates concerning Bill C-18. The NFU launched a public campaign, titled Save Our Seed, to oppose the Agricultural Growth Act. The NFU and FSC were also invited to provide expert witness testimony to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, and the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, respectively. This case not only provides an example of public dialogue on key policy issues, but also lends significant insight into food sovereignty actors' direct engagement with formal legislative processes.

The research for both cases is limited to the years 2009 to 2015. This period captures the relevant events concerning the national food policy proposals discussed above and the passing of the Agricultural Growth Act. The primary units of analysis in this investigation are employees and volunteers with the key national organizations promoting food sovereignty in Canada, namely those of the NFU and FSC.

Data Collection and Analysis

A case study research design can produce robust findings for complex cases when data is crosschecked across multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2003). Therefore, I collected and analysed detailed evidence from a wide range of policymaking documents and semi-structured interviews, highlighting the specific policy activities and ideas of food sovereignty actors in Canada through targeted, exemplary case studies.

This approach aligns with methods employed by food sovereignty and policy paradigm scholars alike. Firstly, the case study design is widely applied in both fields of study (Feindt, 2010; Skogstad & Whyte, 2015; Mendes, 2007; Schiavoni, 2015; Shawki, 2015). Some policy

paradigm research, and most research on food sovereignty, draws on interview data exclusively (Feindt, 2010; Shawki, 2015; Schiavoni, 2015); other policy research relies on a wide range of publicly available documents (Skogstad & Whyte, 2015). This research draws on best practices from both fields, combining document analysis with semi-structured interviews to generate a detailed and nuanced account (Dibden et al., 2009; Daigneault, 2014; Mendes, 2007; Schiff, 2008; Mansfield & Mendes, 2013).

The research was carried out as follows. First, I carried out a document analysis of recorded discussion and debate related to 1) the development of a national food policy in Canada, and 2) the passing of the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18). In both cases, I investigated documents containing evidence of food sovereignty actors' direct engagement in policymaking processes as well as relevant contextual information. I collected documents from: food sovereignty actors (i.e. the NFU and FSC), political and government actors (i.e. major political parties and the Parliament of Canada), and other agri-food policy stakeholders (i.e. Conference Board of Canada, Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute, and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture). In the case of national food policy debates, relevant documents included policy proposals by the above actors, as well as reports, letters, press releases, media publications, political platforms, advertisements for public events, and campaign materials used to promote various food policy ideas. In the case of the Agricultural Growth Act, relevant documents included the legislation itself (Bill C-18), as well as speeches, debates, orders-in-council, legislative publications, government publications, press releases, letters to parliament, and minutes from parliamentary committee meetings.

I obtained these documents by searching the official websites of key food sovereignty actors, political parties, and other key policy stakeholders for documents pertaining to a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act. I also searched the Parliament of Canada's LEGISinfo

database, which provides links to legislation, speeches, vote records, government press releases, and official backgrounders. Since I am studying recent policymaking processes, sufficient evidence was freely accessible through these online sources.

The above procedure generated a very large volume of data: 787 documents in total were retrieved. I narrowed the selection by focusing my analysis on key moments of food sovereignty actors' engagement in agri-food policymaking as well as documents published by the two key national food sovereignty actors (FSC and the NFU) and the Parliament of Canada. This process narrowed it down to 121 key documents. To analyse these 121 key documents, I carefully read each document and identified the ideas, issues, interests, and institutions pertaining to significant instances of food sovereignty actors' federal policy engagement.

A document analysis, however, is limited to capturing the 'ideas revealed,' or expressed in the public sphere (Daigneault, 2014). As a result, researchers who focus exclusively on documents can miss the actual, unexpressed attitudes and beliefs of policy actors (Daigneault, 2014). To avoid this error, I have supplemented the document analysis with semi-structured interviews. Interviews with policy actors capture additional "experiences, opinions, values, aspirations, attitudes, and feelings… [revealing the] inner workings of the political process [and] interactions between actors" (Lilleker, 2003, p. 208). Semi-structured interviews enable a strategic and topical conversation, while maintaining the flexibility to explore additional relevant topics raised by interviewees. In turn, I chose interview questions that targeted gaps or ambiguities in the document analysis.

Based on the document analysis, and using snowball sampling, I identified potential interviewees with direct involvement in the selected cases of federal policymaking. With full approval from the UNBC Research Ethics Board (REB), I contacted 33 potential interviewees by email and phone based on a standardized script. The response rate to these interview requests was 21%.

Accordingly, I conducted 7 interviews with representatives from the NFU and FSC, as well as retired Members of Parliament from the New Democratic Party of Canada (see Appendix A).[12] Interviews were semi-structured and approximately 60 minutes long.

In this research, confidentiality of interviewees cannot be guaranteed since the pool of possible interviewees is small and associated with a few specific organizations. While the conversations presented a low risk to interviewees, the following precautions were taken: interviewees were repeatedly provided with detailed information about the study; interviewees had the opportunity to review and comment on their interview transcript; and interviewees chose whether to be identified by name or as an anonymous representative of their organization. Interviews proceeded only with full ethics clearance from the UNBC REB. Through the interview process, I was granted access and permission to use additional documents, including reports that are not publicly available.

I repeated the analysis protocol described above with each interview transcript, identifying ideas, issues, interests, and institutions concerning food sovereignty actors' key engagement activities in both cases of federal agri-food policymaking. I crosschecked observations between the document analysis and interviews, noting areas of alignment or diversion, and integrating information between the two sets of data where appropriate.

I then considered the significance of these trends in light of existing research on food sovereignty and the public policy literature on state assistance, market liberalism, and multi-functionality paradigms in Canadian agri-food policymaking. For each specific instance of engagement in policymaking, I considered how food sovereignty actors' targeted ideas, issues, interests, and

---

[12] Policy officials from the department of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the Library of Parliament, Members of Parliament from other political parties, and leaders from the *Union Paysanne* all declined the invitation to be interviewed.

institutions aligned with or diverged from established policy paradigms in the context of federal agri-food policymaking in Canada. In this way, the analysis has generated detailed and novel insights into how food sovereignty actors seek to advance and influence ideas in Canadian agri-food policymaking.

Limitations

The scope of this research is limited to actors and policy processes at the federal level. While consideration of provincial policymaking processes may have deepened the analysis, this would have required extensive data collection beyond the scope of a Masters research project. Similarly, interesting linkages could have been drawn to municipal policymaking; however, the engagement of food sovereignty actors in local policy spaces is well documented in the literature already (Mendes, 2007; Schiff, 2008; Mansfield & Mendes, 2013).

The design of this research was also limited by the selection of only two cases, which is the minimum requirement for a multiple case study design. While investigating two cases validates the use of replication logic, the small number of cases limits confidence in the results. Nevertheless, two cases are a reasonable scope for a Master's research project and this exploratory research provides a model for additional replications in future research.

While considerable evidence for this research is publicly available, the document analysis was limited where data has been removed from websites or never published. Furthermore, interview data was limited by the interest, willingness, and availability of interviewees. Some interviewees may have also been suspicious of the study for having a political agenda; or they may have had concerns about how their participation may impact their professional position, party, or organization. Some interviewees may have also been hesitant to disclose potentially confidential or controversial points of view; however, this risk was low since I was not seeking classified or confidential information. Rather, I was seeking to understand broad ideas and issues that were

apparent from interviewees' choices of language. In all contact with interviewees, I aspired to gain trust through professional and clear communication (Lilleker, 2003), and I followed all guidelines of the UNBC REB. Finally, the depth and richness of the data could have been expanded by including a process of participant observation, such as that employed by Mendes to study food sovereignty actors' engagement with municipal policymaking in Canada (2007); however, due to constraints in timing, geography, finances, and access, participant observation was not included in this research design.

Finally, I limited my study to policy engagement events that took place between the years of 2009 and 2015. It is noteworthy that the public debate concerning national food policy did not start in 2009. Civil society's concern with multiple issues of food security and sustainability dates at least to the Peoples Food Commission in the 1970s (Koç et al., 2008). Likewise, the NFU's Save our Seed campaign – a key point of activism in the case of the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) – has roots in opposition to past attempts at introducing UPOV 91 into Canadian legislation in the early 2000's (NFU, 2013). However, in addition to providing a reasonable scope for this Master's research project, the selected study period contains sufficiently rich and relevant evidence concerning direct interaction between food sovereignty actors and key federal policymakers and policymaking processes to answer my specific research questions.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I outlined a detailed methodology to address a critical gap in the social movement and public policy literature. This gap represents a lack of thorough analysis concerning national food sovereignty actors' specific policy engagement in federal agri-food policymaking in Canada. I have proposed a multiple case study exploratory research design, incorporating two carefully selected cases: food sovereignty actors' engagement in debates over 1) a national food policy for Canada and 2) the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18). For both cases, I collect and

analyse multiple sources of evidence, including documents and semi-structured interviews. Finally, I use policy paradigms as a framework of study to guide my analysis and generate novel insights regarding the engagement of food sovereignty actors with policymaking processes and the efforts of food sovereignty actors to influence ideas for national agri-food policymaking in Canada.

Chapter 4: Strategies of Engagement

Introduction

Existing research shows that in Canada, federal agri-food policymaking has typically been dictated by a relatively small group of agri-food experts, farmers, and industry leaders (Moyer & Josling, 2002; Skogstad, 2008b).[13] As a result civil society groups, including food sovereignty actors, have not generally been recognized as active contributors to key agri-food policymaking processes. Skogstad explains, "those who produce and retail food… those who supply farmers with their inputs, and the government ministries responsible for agriculture, dominate the making of agri-food policies [in Canada]… to the exclusion of a broader array of civil society actors" (2012, p. 33). However, in this chapter I provide empirical evidence to demonstrate and explain how food sovereignty actors are now engaging directly in agri-food policymaking activities in Canada.

In this chapter I address my first research question: what strategies do food sovereignty actors employ to engage in federal agri-food policymaking processes? I use evidence from the two case studies of food sovereignty actors' engagement in policymaking processes: national food policy debates and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18). I suggest that food sovereignty actors are using two distinct and simultaneous strategies to engage directly in Canadian agri-food policymaking processes. They are 1) participating actively in national public debates connected to agri-food policymaking processes, and 2) building strategic alliances with federal policymakers and other powerful agri-food stakeholders. In the following analysis, I provide detailed and context-specific evidence and explanations for these two policymaking engagement strategies.

---

[13] These groups are introduced on pages 18-19 in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

I begin by describing food sovereignty actors' strategic efforts to facilitate a public debate on key agri-food policymaking issues. To do this, I highlight three instances of engagement drawn from the two cases of debates over a Canadian national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act. The first two instances of engagement feature Food Secure Canada (FSC) as the key food sovereignty actor in the case of Canadian national food policy debates as they promoted: 1) the People's Food Policy Project and 2) the "Eat Think Vote" campaign coinciding with the 2015 general election. The third instance of engagement highlights the National Farmers Union (NFU) as the key food sovereignty actor in the case of the Agricultural Growth Act, as the NFU organised 3) the "Save Our Seed" campaign in opposition of Bill C-18. In this way I provide empirical evidence of food sovereignty actors' direct engagement with policymakers through the mechanism of public debate and dialogue.

In the second section of this chapter, I describe FSC and the NFU's efforts to build alliances with a wide range of national agri-food policy stakeholders and federal policymakers. Specifically, I explain the relationships that FSC and the NFU have developed with Members of Parliament (MPs) to advance ideas about a national food policy and gain access to parliamentary debates to oppose the Agricultural Growth Act. I then explain the emergence of strategic and unlikely alliances between food sovereignty actors and powerful agri-food industry stakeholders in Canada.

Engagement Strategy #1: Engagement Through Public Debate

Promoting the PFPP in federal policymaking

I begin by discussing the public promotion of the People's Food Policy Project (PFPP) and its final report *Resetting the Table: A People's Food Policy for Canada* (referred to throughout as *Resetting the Table*). I observe that PFPP volunteers and FSC first engaged in a wide reaching public dialogue about food sovereignty ideas and Canadian agri-food policy; then FSC used

Resetting the Table to disseminate a summary of PFPP participants' ideas directly into federal policymaking spaces.

The PFPP was developed by a team of volunteers from a variety of food-related civil society organizations, including FSC, who stated their intention to create a national food policy for Canada based on the ideas and practices of the international food sovereignty movement (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017).[14] As a result, the PFPP employed grassroots public engagement strategies – similar to those used by transnational social movement actors – to generate *Resetting the Table*. PFPP leader, Cathleen Kneen, wrote of the PFPP's primary goal to

> …translate food sovereignty into the context of a Northern, wealthy country… [and] engage people from every sector in developing a [national] policy for food sovereignty, based in and supportive of the needs and perspectives of the whole Canadian people, but particularly food providers and marginalized segments of the population (2012, p. 3).

In practice, the PFPP conducted public meetings called Kitchen Table Talks (KTTs). More than 3500 Canadians participated in the KTTs, in which facilitators guided discussions linking food sovereignty principles to Canadian agri-food policy issues (FSC, 2011b; Kneen, 2012; L. Baker, personal communication, March 23, 2017). Specifically, KTT participants were asked to reflect on: how they make decisions about the food they eat, what obstacles they encounter in implementing these decisions, what level of government might be responsible for the obstacles, and what they would like to change (Kneen, 2012). Volunteers assembled the results of these conversations into 10 working papers and associated federal policy recommendations, summarized in *Resetting the Table*.

---

[14] A summary of the transnational food sovereignty movement is provided in Chapter 2 of this thesis. A more detailed account can be found in Desmarais, 2008.

Importantly, while the PFPP was focused on federal policy issues and generating federal policy proposals, the organizations involved in the PFPP (including FSC) initially had limited direct engagement with Canadian policymaking processes. Andrée et al. suggested in 2011, "the lack of active engagement in federal policy processes to date for many of the organizations involved in the PFPP suggests that they still have a long road ahead in Canada" (p. 139). In other words, without direct engagement in federal policymaking, the policy ideas within the PFPP cannot influence Canadian agri-food policy. Shortly after the publication of Andrée et al.'s article, however, the PFPP leaders took several steps to proactively engage with federal policymakers and policymaking processes.

In 2011, leaders from the PFPP and Food Secure Canada (FSC) met for a strategic planning retreat to coordinate the continued promotion of *Resetting the Table*. At this gathering, the group made several key decisions to develop the capacity of FSC to participate actively in federal policymaking. First, *Resetting the Table* was assumed as the 'operating manual' for FSC's subsequent federal policy engagement efforts (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). Multiple interviews with FSC representatives suggest that this was a critical step in shaping the future work of FSC, as it provided FSC with a mandate to actualize the findings of the PFPP in the Canadian policymaking context. Lauren Baker, a member of the FSC Steering Committee, recalls this decision as influential. Baker states,

> it was decided that [the PFPP]… should be a basis for Food Secure Canada to develop into an advocacy organization… [and] that FSC should take the ownership [of *Resetting the Table*] and create that platform to… build on that work to develop into a new phase of its life... to take up the PFPP [and] develop the capacity of Food Secure Canada (personal communication, March 23, 2017).

Among the diverse group of PFPP leaders, this decision provided FSC with a clear mandate and leadership role to formally represent the PFPP – and thereby thousands of PFPP participants – in future national food policy engagement.

Furthermore, in order to increase the capacity of FSC to promote *Resetting the Table* in Canadian policymaking, FSC required both staff and financial resources. Kathleen Gibson, a representative from FSC's National Food Policy Advisory Committee, recalls the importance of the decision to raise funds in support of a paid Executive Director to carry out future policy engagement efforts. Gibson states,

> if we were going to carry on and carry the People's Food Policy and other initiatives forward, we had to have staff… We were restructuring our organization in order to make a stronger container for the ongoing work (personal communication, March 14, 2017).

In other words, FSC intentionally strategized to increase its capacity as an advocacy organization in order to promote the results of the PFPP among Canadian policymakers. Leaders within FSC deliberately planned to use *Resetting the Table* to connect the public dialogue from the KTTs – concerning national food policy and food sovereignty – directly with Canadian agri-food policymaking processes.

Also in 2011, a general election provided FSC with a strategic opportunity to promote *Resetting the Table* in federal policymaking. At this time, FSC deliberately launched *Resetting the Table* on Parliament Hill in the weeks leading up to the 2011 general election. Leaders within FSC considered the federal election campaign to be a critical opportunity for *Resetting the Table* to influence the agenda of policymakers (Kneen, 2012). In particular, PFPP leaders hoped that a public conversation about food policy during an election would encourage politicians to take action towards generating Canada's first national food policy (FSC, 2011b). This objective was evident throughout the documents and interview data. For example, raising awareness about the

PFPP during the election campaign was so important to the PFPP volunteers that they hurried to complete *Resetting the Table* two months ahead of schedule in order to coincide with the election. Kneen wrote of the event,

> We were working hard to complete the project by July 2011 when a Federal election was called for early May. This was a huge opportunity for us to get food policy on the agenda of all the political parties. We pushed and pulled and drew on all the resources we could muster, and managed to complete a final policy document… and launch it on Parliament Hill two weeks before election day (2012, p. 6).

FSC considered this timing to be critical because the election process creates a unique opportunity for Canadian voters to voice their concerns with federal policymakers. Furthermore, if successful at raising the profile of food policy issues, FSC could influence Canadian voters to select a government based on its stance on food policy. Indeed, the 2011 election was a key moment for the national food policy case, since many of the major political parties had already promised to develop a food policy in their campaign platforms (Conservative Party, 2011; Liberal Party, 2011; NDP, 2011). FSC considered these campaign promises to be incredibly valuable. Amanda Wilson, a Postdoctoral Fellow working with FSC, explains how campaign promises could provide a starting point to collaborate with federal governments; Wilson claims it is easier to approach a government when offering to assist in fulfilling an existing food policy mandate then to make a case to convince the government that they should pursue a food policy (personal communication, March 21, 2017).

The public launch of *Resetting the Table* combined several strategies to raise awareness about food policy and generate public debate among Canadian voters. The first strategy was to hold a public event on Parliament Hill (FSC, 2011b); this created a physical proximity between FSC and policymakers, potentially generating curiosity among parliament staff or politicians and creating opportunities for in-person interactions. This presence also drew the attention of several

major Canadian newspapers (CBC, 2011; Globe and Mail, 2011; FSC, 2011b). National media plays a significant role in guiding public dialogue, especially during an election campaign. Capturing the attention of several national media outlets enabled FSC to spread their ideas widely, and also offered credibility to FSC's ideas simply by publishing them in a reputable newspaper. Finally, FSC distributed copies of *Resetting the Table* to all Members of Parliament (MPs) and other key policymakers in Ottawa (FSC, 2014a), raising awareness among elected officials about the People's Food Policy Project, and the ideas it generated. FSC stated in a press release that all federal MPs "in the House of Commons received a copy of the People's Food Policy and have had a chance to discuss it with [FSC representatives] in a variety of settings" (FSC, 2014a). (I discuss these meetings with MPs in more detail in the second half of this chapter).

Furthermore, FSC relied on its network of supporters to further spread its ideas about food sovereignty and a national food policy among Canadian voters. FSC is a national network, with nearly 100 organizational members as well as individual members in all major geographic regions of the country. FSC's promotional materials from the PFPP public launch explicitly stated the goal to generate public dialogue based on *Resetting the Table* and influence federal political parties to discuss a national food policy throughout the campaign. FSC's press release from the day of the PFPP launch calls on FSC members to "get involved" in raising awareness about *Resetting the Table* and to "make food a key election issue" (FSC, 2011b). FSC encouraged its supporters to use FSC press releases, PFPP materials (such as *Resetting the Table,* and discussion papers), and media reports to engage with their communities and local MPs about food sovereignty and a national food policy in Canada.

The outcome of the 2011 election was a majority Conservative government. Although the Conservative Party had stated intent to develop a national food policy in its election platform

(Conservative Party, 2011), the Conservative government expressed little interest in discussing or developing a food policy after forming government (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). This presented a major challenge for FSC, since FSC relied exclusively on the acceptance of the government to gain access to key policymaking conversations. Alex Atamanenko – former NDP Agriculture Critic – explained the importance of governments being open to civil society groups stating, "unless the government is receptive, grassroots campaign[s] won't work" (personal communication, March 30, 2017). This sentiment was raised in several interviews with food sovereignty actors and former Members of Parliament (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017; M. Allen, personal communication, April 24, 2017). As a result, FSC chose not to spend significant resources attempting to engage with the federal government between 2011-2015. Instead they relied on other strategies (such as forming alliances), discussed in the second half of this chapter, and focused their resources on activities outside of federal agri-food policymaking during the period of the majority Conservative government. FSC leader Cathleen Kneen explained this deliberate strategy as follows:

> Recognizing that the current federal Government is not in the least interested in moving towards food sovereignty, we are strengthening our work in other areas: food sovereignty policy in provinces, cities and municipal regions and institutions; building networks and alliances to push for action on our priorities; supporting local food projects, programs and networks as they build food sovereignty locally; and maintaining and developing the spirit that animated the PFPP: respect for differences and openness to new ways of seeking social justice and ecological integrity (2012, p. 6).

Likewise, Kathleen Gibson – a member of FSC's National Food Policy Advisory Committee – explained that the lack of engagement on the part of the government between 2011 and 2015 was an opportunity for FSC to strengthen its relationships within its own networks in anticipation for future public engagement opportunities with federal policymaking processes (personal communication, March 14, 2017). Speaking about issues of access to federal policymaking

Gibson states, “these things are always only as good as the last election. They [the policymakers] know it and we [at FSC] know it… But then you can make a different kind of mileage when you have a hostile government because you can form stronger relationships with the others… outside government” (personal communication, March 14, 2017). In other words, leaders at FSC believed that the Canadian election cycle would provide their organization with another opportunity to link public dialogue on food sovereignty and national food policy with federal agri-food policymaking processes in the future.

Eat Think Vote

The next critical opportunity for FSC to link public engagement with policymaking processes arrived with the subsequent general election in 2015, at which time FSC launched their campaign, titled Eat Think Vote. The Eat Think Vote campaign involved dozens of non-partisan candidate meetings and an extensive social media campaign, resulting in a nation-wide public conversation between voters and policymakers about federal food policy in Canada. This campaign further illustrates how food sovereignty actors, such as FSC, use public debate during general elections as a tool of engagement in federal policymaking. Additionally, this campaign demonstrates a shift in FSC’s policy engagement strategies compared with the 2011 election campaign discussed above. In 2011, FSC attempted to link public dialogue with policymaking by promoting a detailed policy proposal, *Resetting the Table*. However, in the 2015 campaign, FSC facilitated face-to-face meetings and debates between Canadian voters and federal political candidates focused on five basic points. The Eat Think Vote campaign, therefore, demonstrates increasing direct interactions between food sovereignty actors and policymakers through facilitated public dialogue.

The primary goal of Eat Think Vote – to fuel a national debate among voting Canadians about a food policy – can be illustrated by FSC’s repeated call to “make food a key election issue” (FSC,

2015c). The campaign featured five critical 'campaign asks.' First, FSC called on the government to develop a national food policy for Canada. In addition, FSC highlighted four key federal agri-food issues: food insecurity across Canada; food insecurity issues in northern and Aboriginal communities; assistance for new farmers; and the introduction of a national school food program (FSC, 2015a; FSC, 2015l). These demands are discussed in detail in Chapter 5. Here, I explain how FSC facilitated a dialogue about a national food policy and the selected priority issues. FSC utilized a variety of public engagement strategies, including public meetings with federal candidates, national media coverage, a social media campaign, and official correspondence with political parties.

The public events with federal candidates in the Eat Think Vote campaign were modeled after the grassroots public mobilization efforts of the original PFPP. These events, however, represent a direct engagement with federal policymaking processes, as each event featured a non-partisan candidates debate. FSC relied on its members and other interested community organizations to coordinate most of the candidate meetings, providing facilitation resources to their partner organizations focused on their main campaign goals. A total of 68 events were held in all major geographic regions of the country (including the northern territories), attended by 164 federal candidates and 4461 participants (FSC, 2015c).

These high numbers reveal multiple insights into FSC's role in facilitating public debate about Canadian agri-food policy. Firstly, the number of participants and breadth of geographic regions represented by the Eat Think Vote candidate meetings illustrates FSC's broad capacity to mobilize its networks. Specifically, FSC's ability to engage with 4461 participants over the three-month Eat Think Vote campaign, suggests that FSC scaled-up its capacity to facilitate public meetings since the PFPP (which involved 3500 Canadians over several years, by comparison). Furthermore, 164 federal candidates attended the Eat Think Vote events; this large-

scale participation of political candidates suggests that FSC successfully linked their public dialogues directly with policymaking processes by providing a key forum for cross-partisan debate. Eat Think Vote facilitated this public dialogue with candidates in up to 68 different ridings across the country, reaching a significant and diverse range of geographic and political settings. Since each candidate might only participate in a few such meetings throughout the election, FSC and its partners had a unique ability to influence the topics and structure of election debates within these ridings. This is significant because as candidates engaged in Eat Think Vote events, they competed for votes in their respective communities; as a result, candidates' positions on food issues of interest to FSC – rather than other economic, social, or environmental issues – became pivotal opportunities for candidates to win the favour of their constituents. Furthermore, by engaging with FSC on food issues, such as a national food policy or government support for farmers, candidates provided FSC with specific follow-up points for future advocacy, as well as connections with MPs in cases where candidates who participated in Eat Think Vote also won the election for their riding.

Public debate was further fuelled by the public promotion of Eat Think Vote events and ideas through national media coverage as well as social media. Some national media outlets and many local newspapers covered specific Eat Think Vote events (Globe and Mail, 2015; Global News, 2015a; DurhamRegion, 2015). On social media, FSC circulated a variety of info-graphics to summarize and disseminate key campaign ideas and issues, as well as an online petition to demonstrate wide reaching public support for the campaign. While specific social media statistics are not publicly available, FSC claims "millions [were] reached through radio, television, newspapers and social media" (FSC, 2015c). The combination of in-person conversations with national press attention and social media engagement enabled a countrywide real-time debate about targeted federal policy issues to unfold throughout the election.

This case also reveals insights into how FSC operates internally – specifically through maintaining and leveraging its network of supporters during key moments of policy engagement. In the Eat Think Vote campaign, FSC relied on its networks to generate and disseminate media content through social and mainstream media. Several months prior to the election campaign, FSC ran a workshop at the Canadian Association of Food Studies (CAFS) conference in order to recruit academics and community members involved in food-related research to assist directly with the Eat Think Vote campaign. The CAFS conference program highlights:

> Food Secure Canada and its members and partners will endeavour to make food policy into an issue during the 2015 federal election campaign… This workshop is designed to facilitate collaboration between community actors and academics, and invites the academic community to assist with the production of accessible fact sheets to support FSC's five election demands. Other forms of collaboration (such as symposia, campus events, Op-Eds, and social media strategies) will also be encouraged and discussed. It will solicit the support of academics from different disciplines to inform, support, and strengthen food movement demands in the upcoming election (CAFS, 2015, p. 27).

Dozens of conference delegates attended the workshop, and many responded to FSC's requests to provide content to the online campaign, or otherwise contribute leadership to Eat Think Vote initiatives. This type of cooperation is characteristic of how FSC operates with its various members and partners. Amanda Wilson, a Postdoctoral Fellow working with FSC, explains that FSC regularly operates through a series of such networks, connecting and maintaining regular communication with each member based on mutual interest in particular issues and campaigns. Wilson explains, "I think in terms of collaboration that's often the most common way that plays out; so Food Secure Canada came out with this draft plan for a national food policy engagement, and reached out to all of its allies and members… [asking them to] write a letter of support saying [they] endorse this plan and [they] plan on collaborating" (personal communication, March 21, 2017). Many partnerships become mutually beneficial as FSC, in turn, supports

initiatives by its partners. Wilson notes that this is a common practice among not-for-profits stating, "[many] organizations do that; just like FSC would sign on to something that the NFU does… I think there's a lot of cross pollination… recognizing that we all don't need to take the lead on everything" (personal communication, March 21, 2017). Using these networks to both generate and disseminate Eat Think Vote materials allowed FSC to facilitate a wider-reaching public dialogue than would have been possible using only FSC's limited resources.

In addition to the numerous conversations held with individual candidates, the Eat Think Vote campaign illustrates direct interactions between FSC and federal political parties. FSC sent a survey to five major political parties asking for each party's stance on the idea of creating a national food policy, as well as the Eat Think Vote campaign's four key issues: food insecurity across Canada; food insecurity in the north; support for new farmers; and a national school food program (FSC, 2015a). All parties, with the exception of the incumbent Conservative government, replied to this survey indicating support for developing a national food policy (support for FSC's four key issues was mixed) (FSC, 2015d). This engagement further fuelled public debate as FSC published the results of the survey on its website ahead of the election, and publicized specific commitments in press releases and on social media (FSC, 2015d). The commitment of four major federal parties to support a national food policy was a noteworthy achievement in 2015, since none of the parties' campaign platforms originally included such a promise (FSC, 2015d). Without FSC's direct intervention, it is unlikely that debates over a national food policy would have been as prominent among the major parties in 2015. Furthermore, political parties' prompt and detailed responses to FSC's survey indicate that the parties recognize FSC as an active stakeholder in agri-food policymaking debates. Disseminating political parties' official stance on national food policy also enabled increasingly targeted conversations at Eat Think Vote events, as facilitators had the opportunity to engage directly with their local candidates about their party's commitments.

Despite a lack of evidence supporting a direct causal link between the Eat Think Vote campaign and official election polls, it is noteworthy that rising food prices became the second most important election issue during the campaign (behind the rising cost of living) (Ispos poll in Global News, 2015b).

After the Liberal Party's majority victory in 2015, document and interview evidence suggests that the key ideas and issues targeted in Eat Think Vote gained traction among policymakers. Notably, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau immediately provided his new Minister of Agriculture with a clear mandate to develop Canada's first national food policy in the days following the election. The mandate specifically called on the Minister to "develop a food policy that promotes healthy living and safe food by putting more healthy, high-quality food, produced by Canadian ranchers and farmers, on the tables of families across the country" (Trudeau, 2015). Furthermore, several interviews suggest that FSC was invited to participate in government consultations to develop this policy (L. Baker, personal communication, March 23, 2017; A. Wilson, personal communication, March 21, 2017). These developments indicate that key ideas from the Eat Think Vote campaign subsequently emerged in actual federal agri-food policy agendas, and that FSC is emerging as a key stakeholder, representing the interests of civil society, in key federal agri-food policymaking processes.

The Save Our Seed campaign

Food sovereignty actors also used public dialogue to engage in federal policymaking processes to oppose the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18).

The Agricultural Growth Act was an omnibus bill, meaning it contained amendments to multiple pieces of agri-food legislation and addressed them collectively in each stage of the parliamentary process (i.e., readings, committee, reporting, voting, and royal assent). While there were many changes and contentious issues proposed within the bill, a document analysis revealed that public

debate surrounding the Agricultural Growth Act primarily concerned amendments to the Plant Breeders Rights Act (PBR). The PBR is a piece of Canadian legislation that outlines Canada's commitment to an intellectual property rights protocol known as the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (often referred to by its French acronym, UPOV) (CFIA, 2015b).

Prior to the Agricultural Growth Act, Canada had committed to an earlier version of the protocol known as UPOV 78 (CFIA, 2013). The Agricultural Growth Act proposed an amendment to Canada's PBR to align Canada's international commitments with the newer version of the protocol, UPOV 91. This was a significant move for Canada, since UPOV 91 includes additional intellectual property (IP) rights for international plant breeding corporations, not included in UPOV 78 (CFIA, 2013). These exclusive IP rights suggest restrictions on how farmers use or handle certain seeds varieties, and potentially generate additional royalties for seed companies, among other benefits (CFIA, 2015a).

Food sovereignty actors considered these protections for plant breeders to be a direct threat to traditional farmer-to-farmer seed saving and trading practices. As a result, food sovereignty actors, under the leadership of the National Farmers Union (NFU), undertook a large campaign project to raise awareness and public opposition to Bill C-18. This campaign illustrates how food sovereignty actors utilize public dialogue and debate to gain access to formal parliamentary processes, such as meetings of the House of Commons and parliamentary committees.

In December 2013, the Agricultural Growth Act had its First Reading in the House of Commons – the first step in passing any proposed legislation (Parliament of Canada, 2013). Soon after, the NFU launched a public campaign, titled Save Our Seed, calling on Members of Parliament to "Stop Bill C-18" (NFU, n.d.; FSC, 2014b). During this campaign, the NFU utilized a wide variety of techniques to 1) provide succinct information and analysis of the bill and its

implications for Canadian farmers' ability to practice seed saving, and 2) facilitate the general public to advocate their local MP representatives to oppose Bill C-18.

The NFU published detailed analyses supporting its stance on Bill C-18 shortly after the bill's first reading. Former NFU Vice President Policy, Ann Slater, recalled that the proposal to adopt UPOV 91 was not a new issue for the NFU; the question of amending the PBR had been raised previously, in the early 2000s, at which time the NFU carried out the first Save Our Seed campaign (personal communication, March 27, 2017). While the NFU was pleased with the government's previous decision to remain under UPOV 78, several of the NFU's key members continued to monitor the issue. Slater explained,

> in a way we never let go of that campaign. It was always one that was there [and] that comes forward a bit more sometimes… One of the things the NFU is always [concerned about] is corporate control of agriculture [and] corporate control of – in this case – seeds… So we're always working on and looking at things from that angle, always keeping the seed angle there (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Drawing on 'years of research,' Slater further explained that the NFU's top priority in launching the public campaign was to create a package of detailed yet concise information that explained the issues and implications of Bill C-18 in common language. The NFU aimed to create educational materials about the bill that would be easy to understand for both the general public as well as MPs who did not have particular expertise in agri-food policy or intellectual property issues. As Slater explains,

> the first thing we had to do was to read the bill…, do our analysis, and… put together our package of material about what this really meant. We had to decide which were the key points, because we couldn't address everything that was in it… [We] knew we had to go to the public and try and help them understand… so put it in language they can understand… (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Slater's explanation of the NFU's approach to bill C-18 indicates that the NFU was dedicating significant resources to educating the public about the content and implications of Bill C-18. Some of these educational materials included backgrounders, press releases, 'question and answer' pages, and commentary pieces (NFU, n.d.). These articles highlighted just a few key issues from the large omnibus bill, including concerns that Bill C-18 would: enable seed companies to collect royalties on both seed purchases and sales of harvested crops; create restrictions on "farmers' privilege" to save and re-use seed; limit the development of new seed varieties to those that are internationally marketable, rather than locally adapted; reduce the checks and balances needed to modify the legislation in the future; and exacerbate debt loads of Canadian farmers (NFU, 2014a; NFU, 2015a). These specific issues are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

In terms of the NFU's strategy of raising public awareness, the effort of summarizing these complex issues in concise and accessible language enabled many Canadians to understand and form opinions about this bill. The deliberate strategy to study and explain the bill in lay people's terms was the NFU's first step in generating meaningful public dialogue about this lengthy and highly technical bill. The NFU used its website to publicize these materials and encourage its members and partners to further disseminate the information widely (NFU, n.d.).

In an additional effort to raise awareness about the bill, the NFU partnered with Food Secure Canada (FSC) to host an online webinar (FSC, 2014c). This broadcast served as an opportunity to provide more detailed information about the bill and answer questions directly from members of the public. The partnership with FSC also extended the networks of the NFU to include a larger base of largely urban-dwelling consumers who might not have been connected with the NFU directly. Educating and engaging a broad spectrum of Canadians was an important part of

the NFU's strategy, as farmers and urban Canadians alike engaged actively in the Save Our Seed campaign (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

To facilitate further dialogue about the Agricultural Growth Act and concerns about the PBR amendments, the NFU strongly encouraged its membership to host meetings or to inform and engage their own networks in discussions about the Agricultural Growth Act and the implications of UPOV 91 for Canadian farmers (FSC, 2014d). Specifically, the NFU website provided a "guide to organize a public meeting on Bill C-18 in your community" and resources on "how to hold a meeting with your MP" (NFU, n.d.). Furthermore, the NFU encouraged its members to circulate a petition opposing Bill C-18, and to submit paper copies of this petition to their elected MP (FSC, 2014d). This was a significant strategy, according to former Vice President Policy from the NFU, Ann Slater. Since MPs were obligated to report hard-copy petitions to the House of Commons, this provided the public with an opportunity to have their MPs represent opposing views during a highly divisive partisan debate, regardless of the political leanings in their particular riding (personal communication, March 27, 2017). Similarly, the NFU provided post-cards with a summary of their key concerns and a request for MPs to "take all actions necessary to stop Bill C-18" (NFU, n.d.). The post-cards were provided to the general public, in order that individuals might sign them and send them to their representative MPs. This provided an efficient and eye-catching way for large numbers of people to make their opinions, and support for the NFU, known to numerous MPs in Ottawa.

This public engagement was critical to the NFU's advocacy work to oppose the Agricultural Growth Act. The NFU believed that simply educating the public was not sufficient to stimulate meaningful engagement; rather, "the public needs something to do. You can't just give information. You've got to have something to do" (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017). In this case, the engagement was effective in reaching MPs from many different

parties and regions of the country. For example, multiple Conservative MPs are recorded to have presented the NFU petitions to "Stop Bill C-18" in the House of Commons (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017). Despite the strong Conservative support for the bill, MPs were required to present petitions from their constituencies regardless of their personal convictions. The postcard campaign also received attention from MPs in multiple ridings. Former MP Megan Leslie recalls receiving hundreds of NFU campaign postcards from her largely urban riding of Halifax, Nova Scotia (personal communication, March 24, 2017). Leslie received post-cards directly from her own constituents, and recalled a wealth of support for the NFU's campaign. Leslie suggested that this urban support stemmed from consumers' attitudes in Halifax, such that "even if people aren't connected to the land directly here, they want to be in support of those who are" (personal communication, March 24, 2017). In summary, the National Farmers Union harnessed broad civil society support during their Save Our Seed campaign.

Engagement Strategy #2: Building Alliances with Key Policymaking Stakeholders

The second strategy that food sovereignty actors utilize to engage in agri-food policymaking is to establish and maintain alliances with powerful agri-food policy actors. In this section I draw on evidence from both case studies – debates over a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) – to illustrate how food sovereignty actors build alliances with Members of Parliament (MPs), as well as key agri-food industry stakeholders.

Alliances with Members of Parliament

Food sovereignty actors utilize a variety of strategies to win the attention of federal Members of Parliament. Both case studies show that FSC and the NFU engage with policymakers by contacting MPs directly, arranging meetings and phone calls, writing letters to ministers and other MPs, and ultimately gaining invitations to present to parliamentary committees for the Senate and the House of Commons during key moments of policy debate.

To promote their ideas about a national food policy based on food sovereignty, FSC works to develop and maintain relationships inside federal ministries and carry out direct advocacy work on Parliament Hill. FSC claims that, although very little of their funding is directly allocated to building such alliances, relationships with policymakers are a key element of their mandate. Lauren Baker, a member of FSC's Steering Committee, explained that FSC "has been doing this advocacy on [Parliament] Hill. FSC… hasn't been funded really to do that work, but it's been constantly articulated by the membership that that's important" (personal communication, March 23, 2017). Without significant financial resources directed towards building relationships with federal policymakers, FSC relies on its Executive Director to incorporate alliance building as a component of other projects. According to Baker, this strategy has been relatively effective for FSC; Baker states, FSC's current Executive Director is "very skilled in that way" (personal communication, March 23, 2017), suggesting that the Executive Director is a key actor in the process of networking and building relationships with policymakers. Furthermore, Baker claims that the current Executive Director is particularly well positioned to make meaningful connections with policymakers in Ottawa, as the current Executive Director previously worked on Parliament Hill (personal communication, March 23, 2017). Building on these personal connections, the current Executive Director is able to gain meetings with high-ranking federal policymakers to advocate for the priorities of Food Secure Canada. Importantly, key leaders in FSC's network also support the Executive Director in strategizing about strategic relationships with policymakers (L. Baker, personal communication, March 23, 2017).

As further evidence of this engagement strategy, the former NDP Agriculture Critic for the Official Opposition between 2011 and 2015 – Malcolm Allen – explained both his personal connection to the Executive Director at Food Secure Canada, and the implications of this connection for FSC's ability to access meetings with agri-food policymakers in Ottawa. Allen explains,

> I actually know [FSC's Executive Director]… quite well. [The Executive Director] used to… [work for] for Jack Layton many years ago, so there's a connection between FSC and us [the NDP]. Many of my colleagues… knew [FSC's Executive Director] personally really well. We like the work that they [at FSC] do, as New Democrats. I like the work that they do, personally. So… if they [FSC] called, then I take the meeting (M. Allen, personal communication, April 24, 2017).

Especially during the years that the NDP held the official opposition to the federal government (2011-2015), FSC's strong personal connections to the federal NDP provided them with unique and strategic access to key policymakers.

Furthermore, Allen recalled that FSC was one of the few civil society organizations that would request meetings with him as Opposition Agriculture Critic. Allen states,

> [civil society groups] have a tendency, if they're going to talk to an MP, they do it though their [local] constituency office. That's where they would come; so, they don't necessarily lobby you, [but] Food Secure Canada will (personal communication, April 24, 2017).

Allen's remarks carry two significant implications. Firstly, this evidence supports my observation that FSC actively seeks to build relationships with influential policymakers. Secondly, Allen indicates that FSC's advocacy work to seek alliances with key agri-food policymakers was relatively unique among civil society organizations, as other similar groups would opt to speak with their local MP in their riding. FSC, on the other hand, seeks high-level meetings to promote their ideas directly.

Additionally, during the study period FSC routinely reached out to MPs by inviting them to biannual national assemblies. At FSC's 2012 National Assembly in Edmonton, Alberta, two Members of Parliament along with members of FSC participated in a plenary panel discussion that highlighted a need for non-traditional agri-food policy stakeholders to participate in federal policymaking processes. Accordingly, FSC's 2012 Assembly report stated, "all panellists spoke

of the need for government to work with populations that are negatively affected by food policy (or lack thereof), be it people living with food insecurity, First Nations communities, farmers, or food processors" (FSC, 2012, p. 7). Similar discussions also took place with two different MPs at FSC's 2014 National Assembly in Halifax, Nova Scotia (FSC, 2014e). Food Secure Canada's organized and deliberate engagement with policymakers demonstrates that civil society groups are taking a more direct and organized approach to participation in federal agri-food decision-making. Multiple interviewees highlighted FSC's conferences and assemblies as critical moments of meaningful engagement with policymakers due to the rich opportunity for detailed dialogue with the policymakers in attendance. For each of these events, FSC representatives invited targeted MPs, who were known to be allies among food sovereignty actors already (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). In this way, FSC was successful at establishing a detailed and meaningful dialogue about their proposed ideas, gaining valuable face-time with policymakers, and opportunities for detailed conversations about their issues of concern (FSC, 2012).

Another approach used by FSC to engage with policymakers is traditional correspondence, for example, between FSC and federal MPs through written letters. FSC has written to the Prime Minister, Ministers of Agriculture and Health, as well as a number of individual MPs (FSC, n.d.-d). These letters, along with any letters of response are shared with FSC's broader membership and the general public on FSC's website. FSC's letters to high-ranking policy makers enable an open line of communication with MPs who may not otherwise agree to meet with FSC. In this way, FSC ensures that its ideas, attitudes, and priorities about key agri-food issues are well known among a diverse group of policymakers. In particular, FSC initiated correspondence with the Minister of Agriculture (Bronson, 2015) shortly after the Minister received a mandate from Prime Minister Justin Trudeau to develop a national food policy in 2015 (Trudeau, 2015). FSC's letter outlines the specific ways that FSC proposes to support the government in developing such

a policy (Bronson, 2015). FSC's repeated efforts to establish relationships and allies among policymakers suggests a level of organized policy engagement from civil society that was previously unprecedented in federal agri-food policymaking.

The case of the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) provides additional evidence of food sovereignty actors' direct engagement with MPs. In this case, the NFU is the leading food sovereignty actor and utilizes similar strategies to develop and maintain alliances with key agri-food policymakers in Ottawa. Ann Slater – NFU Vice President Policy at the time of Bill C-18 – explained the NFU's deliberate outreach and engagement with MPs as part of the NFU's Save Our Seed campaign. First, according to Slater, the NFU formed a committee and strategized about whom to contact, and chose to target MPs they believed would be both supportive and influential. Slater recalls,

> we [went] to… the friends that we had within the Liberal party and the NDP. We really had to push them… So [we considered] the 'Ag Committee;' who are the people on the 'Ag Committee' from the [opposition] parties? Within the Liberal Party, there's also… the former president of the National Farmers Union… So I got in touch with their offices (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Like FSC, the NFU already had personal connections among opposition members. These friendships and personal connections provided the NFU with access to key policymakers in Ottawa, generating opportunities to speak about their particular interests and key issues of concern. At the same time, Slater notes that despite some connections, accessing certain policymakers remained a challenge, requiring persistent effort to gain access to policymakers and communicate their concerns. Finally, Slater's comments highlight that, much like the engagement of FSC discussed above, the NFU targeted high-ranking policy-makers with influential positions on the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food (HCSCAAF) (referred to in quotations as the 'Ag Committee').

In order to make connections with MPs sitting on the HCSCAAF, the NFU presented itself as an informed stakeholder, offering to explain their research and stakeholder analysis of Bill C-18 in detail to targeted agri-food policymakers over the phone. Slater explains,

> [we] reach[ed] out to the members of the 'Ag Committee' that were from the [opposition] parties… We phoned their offices... I think one of the things [we were asking them] was "do you really know what this means? We'd be happy to share our analysis with you. We're happy to talk one-on-one; we're happy to have a telephone conversation with you" (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

This outreach was successful with respect to MPs for the official government opposition who were sitting on the HCSCAAF. Before receiving an invitation to speak at HCSCAAF, several key members of the NDP met with NFU representatives through a conference call. This provided Slater and her committee with a critical opportunity to inform and potentially influence strategic policymakers, who were well positioned to carry the NFU's ideas forward into critical debates in the House of Commons. Slater recalls,

> with Bill C-18 we had a conference call with the NDP… [with] specific [MPs] who were on the 'Ag Committee' or had some interest in agriculture. Because one of the things you want to do is – when they study that at committee level – to appear before the 'Ag committee' and we did get to do that (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Not only was the NFU successful in communicating its analysis and interpretation of the Agricultural Growth Act to members of the HCSCAAF through meetings, but they also provided MPs with written research, policy briefs, and analyses of the Bill. These resources were often the same written resources used to educate the general public about the bill. The NFU recognized that many MPs are not legal experts, but rather come to Parliament with training in a wide variety of fields; as a result, Slater explains the NFU's strategy to provide MPs with policy briefs in layman's terms. Slater states,

> in doing that analysis [to interpret Bill C-18] we had to… have something that we could pass on to MPs… It's the same; you need the MPs to understand, so [we] put it in language they can understand… We [also] need the public to do that (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

According to Slater, these briefs were an important strategy in highlighting the NFU's priority issues and ideas in meetings with policymakers.

Alex Atamanenko was the NDP Agriculture Critic in the years prior to the introduction of Bill C-18. He remembers using similar research provided by the NFU. He recalls "the reports [the NFU] did, we would often look at… it was just superb research" (A. Atamanenko, personal communication, March 30, 2017). Likewise, the subsequent NDP Agriculture Critic for the Official Opposition during the debates over Bill C-18, Malcolm Allen, recalls the NFU reports on the Agricultural Growth Act specifically. He explained that in the case of researching the Agricultural Growth Act, "the NFU had done a great deal of work. They have a couple of folks who are really quite brilliant with that work and research, so we utilized it. It was easy to use; it was already there. It was things that we agreed with" (personal communication, April 24, 2017). As further evidence of the NFU's influence in the debates over Bill C-18, MPs from the NDP quoted NFU reports in the House of Commons during key debates concerning the Agricultural Growth Act. For example, parliamentary transcripts document Atamanenko as well as NDP MP Megan Leslie's direct opposition of Bill C-18 in the House of Commons, using the NFU's analysis to highlight various long-term implications of adopting UPOV 91 in Canadian legislation, and additional background information related to the bill (Parliament of Canada, 2014a; Parliament of Canada, 2014b). This evidence indicates that by fostering strong allies with key agri-food policy actors, food sovereignty actors gain access and extend their ideas into critical moments of Canadian agri-food policymaking.

Furthermore, allying with policymakers also enables food sovereignty actors to gain direct access to parliamentary committee hearings as expert witnesses. Strong relationships with committee members are essential in order to speak at committee meetings, since presentations of expert testimony are awarded by invitation only (A. Atamanenko, personal communication, March 30, 2017). Both the NFU and FSC were invited to speak to parliamentary committees to testify concerning the Agricultural Growth Act. The NFU appeared before the HCSCAAF as well as the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (SSCAF).[15] FSC was invited to present to the SSCAF only (Bronson & Mooney, 2015). Providing expert testimony to a parliamentary committee enables food sovereignty actors to influence legislative changes by advocating for specific amendments to the bill. According to Atamanenko, witnesses play a key role in committee work, as they provide committee members with the opportunity to hear about potential implications of a bill from a wide variety of stakeholders, and question them directly about their concerns. If committee members are convinced that a change should be made, they have the opportunity to amend the legislation based on the expert testimony before a final report is delivered back to the House of Commons (A. Atamanenko, personal communication, March 30, 2017). In the case of the Agricultural Growth Act, a key amendment – strongly advocated for by the NFU – was made following the committee hearings.[16]

Since FSC's presentation to the SSCAF occurred later in the parliamentary process, no such direct outcome can be identified from their testimony. However, it is noteworthy that FSC used their committee presentation on Bill C-18 to also promote ideas about a national food policy and distribute copies of *Resetting the Table* directly to members of the Canadian Senate.

---

[15] For a detailed account of the specific issues raised by the NFU in these hearings, see Chapter 5 of this thesis.
[16] This change concerned the specific wording of the "farmers' privilege" clause, specifying the activities that farmers would be allowed to perform on any seeds they saved from year to year. This issue is described in more detail in Chapter 5.

Furthermore, the Senators engaged with FSC on the topic of national food policy, using the question period for Bill C-18 to clarity FSC's key policy positions related to *Resetting the Table* (SSCAF, 2015).

This section has provided detailed evidence of how food sovereignty actors develop and utilize key alliances with federal policymakers in order to advance their ideas within Canadian agri-food policymaking processes. Next, I discuss how food sovereignty actors also build strategic alliances with powerful agri-food industry actors in order to extend their potential influence in Canadian federal agri-food policymaking.

Unlikely allies in the industrial agri-food sector

In their 2011 article on the People's Food Policy Project, Andrée et al. indicate the potential for unlikely alliances to form between food sovereignty actors and key agri-food policy stakeholders in Canada. In this research, both case studies of debates over a national food policy for Canada and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) indicate that food sovereignty actors are indeed building strategic relationships with key agri-food industry stakeholders. This is nonetheless surprising, since the roots of the food sovereignty concept emerged from a transnational social movement that explicitly opposed the spread of industrial agricultural practices and power of corporate agri-business (Desmarais, 2008). In Canada, food sovereignty actors have a similar history of denouncing policies favouring market liberal ideals, such as international market access and export-oriented trade agreements (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017; K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). Yet, the NFU and FSC work to foster allies with certain actors in the agri-food industry, seeking out common interests while paying close attention to conflicting ones.

To illustrate food sovereignty actors' selective engagement with industry, I first discuss a situation in which food sovereignty actors had the opportunity to connect with industry, but

remained highly sceptical about whether the invitation represented a meaningful opportunity for genuine dialogue, or a token effort at civil society representation. Specifically, the Conference Board of Canada invited several food sovereignty actors (including the NFU and FSC) to participate in their food policy development process. Both FSC and the NFU viewed the Conference Board's project strictly as a 'food industry' strategy (Slater, 2013) due to the Conference Board's emphasis on maximizing economic growth and the project's exclusive funding from large agri-food businesses (Slater, 2013; Slomp, n.d.).

Despite historic tensions between food sovereignty actors and industrial agri-food companies, relationships between these groups can also be positive. In response to the launch of the PFPP in 2011, the Globe and Mail described "the warm reception [the PFPP] has received from competitors-turned-collaborators. That includes the Canadian Federation of Agriculture [CFA]" (2011). The CFA is a major farmers union in Canada, representing provincial farmer groups as well as national commodity groups. The Globe and Mail article further explains that while the CFA also developed a national food policy proposal, which emphasizes the sustainability of agricultural production for both domestic and international sale, the CFA maintained a positive relationship and general support for the PFPP. In this way, by maintaining "an open dialogue with the PFPP" industrial agri-food representatives at the CFA "add[ed] credibility to the PFPP, which would at one time have been considered a fringe effort" (Globe and Mail, 2011). In other words, in order to be taken seriously in Canadian agri-food policymaking, FSC requires the support of both civil society and industry leaders.

As a further illustration of alliances between food sovereignty actors and agri-food industry, Maple Leaf Foods, a major industrial food company in Canada, hosted a key Eat Think Vote event in Toronto during the 2015 general election. The event brought together food sovereignty actors, academics, agri-food industry leaders, and political candidates; the event also received

national media attention. Specifically, a panel discussion featured: the Executive Director of FSC; an academic from the University of Guelph; the President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA); and federal candidates from the Liberal Party and the NDP (Globe and Mail, 2015). The event was webcast online and disseminated via the Globe and Mail and social media. All members on this unique and hi-profile panel voiced their desire for increased collaboration to tackle the recognized complexities of food insecurity in Canada and around the world (Globe and Mail, 2015).

In an interview, a representative from FSC described FSC's relationship with industry partners stating, "one of them is… a large commercial food company; we have a relationship with their senior management that is very mutually respectful" (personal communication, 2017). When asked how FSC developed relationships with industrial food actors, the interviewee explained that these types of relationships developed initially "based on personal friendships" (personal communication, 2017). In this way, FSC's strategy for engaging industry actors mirrors its strategies for engaging policymakers in Ottawa. While there remain some tensions and conflicting interests between the two groups, the interviewee claims that FSC and their industry ally share common concerns about the issue of food insecurity. The interviewee stated that between FSC and the industry ally, "we don't agree on everything, but they have actually leaned into key issues around food insecurity in a really interesting way" (personal communication, 2017). The interviewee also noted that relationships with powerful agri-food stakeholders are tenuous, since they rely on individual connections rather than official partnerships between the organizations. Specifically, the interviewee claimed, "those kinds of relationships are only as good as the individuals involved in them. If that senior manager changed, that whole thing could change" (personal communication, 2017). Time and future research will be necessary to judge the durability of alliances between food sovereignty actors and agri-food industry actors. Yet, the

existence of these relationships indicates the potential for previously polarized policy actors to work together to influence agri-food policymaking.

Despite often-divergent interests, FSC understands that working with industry partners is critical in order to generate meaningful solutions to issues such as food insecurity in Canada (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017; L. Baker, personal communication, March 23, 2017). Lauren Baker – a member of FSC's Steering Committee – suggested that as FSC evolved as a federal advocacy group, the organization has adapted to the broader policymaking environment and the diverse set of actors within that context. As a result, Baker suggests that FSC's advocacy regarding food sovereignty has adapted to the federal agri-food policymaking context as well. Baker claims,

> in the People's Food Policy the goal of food sovereignty was very explicit... I think in this phase [of negotiating with policymakers] the goals change and are adapted over time to the political context. So now, the goal has to be about actually collaborating with a wider circle – with industry [and other groups]. Food sovereignty takes on a bit of a different shape there (personal communication, March 23, 2017).

In other words, while the PFPP focused primarily on networking with civil society groups, FSC is now working to balance its advocacy and include more powerful actors in policymaking conversations. As a result, FSC is seeking a balance between the core ideas of food sovereignty, which both oppose industrial agricultural practices, and a call for broad collaborative practices. According to Baker, this involves keeping the core principles of food sovereignty in mind, while acknowledging that many Canadian farmers do rely on industrial agriculture to make a living. In this sense, Baker suggests that if food sovereignty in Canada is to represent the collaborative direction of the agri-food sector, this will require a balance between many divergent, and sometimes competing interests. Baker explains,

> it doesn't mean that there's not a whole interest in food sovereignty that's staying true to those original ideas behind it, but the policymaking process probably has to be a bit more flexible and inclusive to new stakeholders that the original food sovereignty [and] People's Food Policy process didn't connect with, [including industry actors]… You have to bring some of it [food sovereignty] to the table and accept that you [also] need exports and patch it together (personal communication, March 23, 2017).

This flexibility to accept some ideas from the industrial sector, such as the need for international market access, suggests that FSC is increasingly sensitive to the diverse set of interests at the federal agri-food policymaking table, and is seeking to establish and maintain relationships with a wide range of agri-food policy actors. As governments are also seeking to negotiate between these complex and competing interests (Moyer & Josling, 2002), FSC's openness to industry partnerships is an asset in seeking recognition as a key federal agri-food policy stakeholder; recognition from established and influential policy stakeholders could increase FSC's credibility as it seeks to gain access to and influence federal policymaking processes.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I used the case studies of a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) to explain two main strategies by which food sovereignty actors engage in federal agri-food policymaking processes. The first engagement strategy is to organize public debates and campaigns to inform and mobilize Canadians on agri-food policy issues; the second strategy is to build alliances with Members of Parliament and agri-food industry stakeholders in order to gain direct access to policymaking processes and decision-making venues, such as Parliament.

Chapter 5: Food Sovereignty Ideas and Agri-Food Policymaking

Introduction

The food sovereignty concept broadly incorporates a wide variety of ideas about numerous social, economic, and environmental justice issues; however, as Canadian food sovereignty actors engage in federal agri-food policymaking processes, they make strategic choices about which food sovereignty-related ideas to promote in policymaking contexts. Therefore, this chapter addresses my second research question: how do food sovereignty actors seek to influence Canadian federal agri-food policymaking ideas? To answer this question, I present empirical evidence from two cases studies – debates over a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) – to show how and why Canadian food sovereignty actors are advocating ideas about 1) autonomy of farmers and 2) public participation in agri-food policymaking in Canada. I explain the significance of these two ideas with respect to the policy paradigms of state assistance, market liberalism, and multi-functionality. I argue that food sovereignty actors seek to influence policymaking processes by focusing their advocacy on certain food sovereignty ideas, and that these ideas align with established policy paradigms in Canadian agri-food policymaking.

Food Sovereignty Idea #1: Farmer Autonomy in Canada

Food sovereignty actors advocate for the autonomy of Canadian farmers in both case studies of national food policy debates and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18). Farmer autonomy is a well established idea in the food sovereignty movement, and Canadian food sovereignty actors link autonomy with several key policy issues, including: steadily rising farm debts and chronic net-income losses for Canadian farmers; a rapidly aging farm population; increasing consolidation of family farms into large-scale export-oriented businesses; and the intellectual property rights granted to large seed breeding corporations through the Agricultural Growth Act. In this section, I argue that through these specific issues, food sovereignty proponents seek to

advance their ideas about farmer autonomy in Canada. These key ideas and issues align with the state assistance and multi-functionality paradigms. As a result, food sovereignty proponents seek to influence federal policies that maintain or strengthen state intervention in support of Canadian small-scale family famers and resist the influence of market liberal ideas in federal agri-food policymaking.

Farmer autonomy, family farming, and local food

Beginning with the case of national food policy debates and the promotion of *Resetting the Table* among federal policymakers, FSC has actively voiced concerns about the viability of family farming in Canada on Parliament Hill. Supported by research from the National Farmers Union, FSC claims that largely due to pressures and expenses associated with industrial agriculture, "Canada's farm sector is one of the world's least profitable" (FSC, 2011a). FSC cites negative sales-only income levels for Canadian farms between 2003-2010 and calls the government to accurately report discrepancies between sales income and income levels that include "credit, government support, and off-farm jobs" (FSC, 2011a; CFA, 2011). This means that Canadian farmers are actually losing money on their businesses from year-to-year; yet their incomes are reported as increasing as farmers' incomes are subsidized by both government payments and the employment of other family members off-farm. According to food sovereignty actors, this reliance on other forms of income is a major threat to the autonomy of family farmers in Canada.

Likewise, in the case of the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18), the NFU was highly critical of the government's proposed adjustments to the Agricultural Marketing Programs Act – one of the nine bills amended by the large omnibus bill. The NFU was specifically concerned with changes

to eligibility for advanced payment loans[17] between the federal government and farmers. Although the NFU acknowledged that many indebted farmers would welcome access to increased credit, the NFU voiced concern that the changes would exacerbate the existing farm debt crisis by increasing already high debt loads without addressing the underlying causes (NFU, 2015a). Research shows that Canadian farmers' net income has been in decline since 1985, despite a consistent rise in Canadian food exports during the same period (Qualman, 2011). The same research indicates a consistent and drastic increase in Canadian farm debt along with increasing trends towards industrialization in Canadian agriculture (Qualman, 2011).

Furthermore, according to FSC, increasingly high costs of production contribute not only to farm debts, but also create significant barriers-to-entry for new farmers. During the Eat Think Vote campaign, FSC reported that more than 80% of Canadian farmers are expected to retire in the next 10 years (FSC, 2015k). Yet, FSC suggests that the Canadian government's emphasis on large-scale industrial agriculture prevents new farmers from entering the sector to replace Canada's aging farm population, especially if potential new farmers prefer alternative farming methods such as agro-ecology or organic farming, which do not receive the same government support (FSC, 2015k). FSC's Eat Think Vote campaign highlighted the need for the government to increase access to resources, ensuring "better access to land, capital, and training for new farmers," and to provide support for increased diversity in Canadian farming practices (FSC, 2015k). FSC's position on diversifying government supports for Canadian farmers carries the underlying idea that existing agri-food policy limits farmers' autonomy over how they produce food.

---

[17] This is a government loan program, the terms of which are outlined in the Canadian Agricultural Marketing Programs Act (NFU, 2014a).

FSC and the NFU propose that the solution to the 'farm income crisis' rests in localizing supply chains, directing local demand to support producers directly within the community. According to the PFPP, increasing exports create 'losses for our [domestic] economies' as Canadians increasingly rely on imports to supply a variety of food products that can be grown, processed and stored in Canada (FSC, 2011a), and farmers increasingly rely on the availability of external markets for their products. *Resetting the Table* proposes that Canada reduce farmers' dependence on export markets by prioritizing the domestic production of a variety of food products to feed Canadians, and then trade surplus crops through international exports, an approach termed "feed the family, trade the leftovers" (FSC, 2011a). FSC argues in *Resetting the Table* that adopting this approach creates multiple benefits across society: farmers would gain stable market access, consumers benefit from fresh products, and the resulting relationships would strengthen Canadian communities (FSC, 2011a). Furthermore, FSC claims that by strengthening Canada's domestic capacity to process and market locally produced food, small-scale Canadian farmers will be able to stabilize their debt and generate increasingly viable businesses due to predictable market prices associated with locally regulated markets, and potentially lower in-put costs for farmers who choose agro-ecology or organic farming methods.

I suggest that food sovereignty actors' idea to support the autonomy of Canadian farmers by prioritizing the sale of locally produced food in domestic markets resonates with the state assistance paradigm, as it mirrors existing Canadian policies of supply management. The supply management system – regarded as a pillar of state assistance in Canada – regulates the prices, quotas, and competition for certain food products, such as milk and poultry (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014). Although market liberal pressures have repeatedly challenged the Canadian supply management system, federal policymakers have vehemently defended supply-managed sectors in both Canadian Parliament and international free trade negotiations (M. Allen, personal communication, April 24, 2017). This trend indicates federal governments' willingness to

consistently regulate local production and sales of specific food products, and defend policies of government intervention against competing market liberal ideas. Furthermore, all federal parties consistently stated direct support for the continuation of supply management in their election platforms during the study period (Conservative Party, 2011; Conservative Party 2015; Liberal Party 2011; Liberal Party 2015; NDP, 2011; NDP, 2015), indicating that politicians and their constituents believe that the government's continued management of these sectors remains in the national interest. Food sovereignty actors' ideas about government intervention align with pre-existing policy ideas in Canada captured by the state assistance paradigm, as they propose a variety of strategies to increase local market access for Canadian family farmers.

Food sovereignty actors seek to build on existing policy support for supply management by extending regulations for localized food production and distribution systems to other agricultural products (for example, fruits and vegetables), in addition to milk, eggs, and poultry. According to FSC, this would require significant changes to Canadian federal agri-food policies, such as reopening food-processing facilities, and redistributing existing government financial support from large-scale operations to smaller ones (FSC, 2011a). Specifically, *Resetting the Table* calls on Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada to "shift significant resources away from… export-focused agriculture and toward a community-based, sustainability focused agriculture" (FSC, 2011a; Globe and Mail, 2011). Furthermore, FSC promotes the use of government supports to encourage a small-scale, agro-ecological, and highly diverse farm sector in Canada (FSC, 2011a). This model would present a major shift from the current direction of increasingly large industrial farm operations, and export-oriented federal policy frameworks associated with the market liberal policy paradigm (AAFC, 2014).

Food sovereignty actors, therefore, align themselves with allies in Canadian policymaking who view policymaking from the lens of state assistance, and therefore agree with the principles of

government intervention in Canadian agriculture and support for small-scale family farmers. Alex Atamanenko – former NDP Agriculture Critic from 2006-2011 – explained his commitment to supporting localized production and market access as a means of supporting Canadian family farming businesses. Atamanenko states,

> I think that food sovereignty is a part of [state] sovereignty. We're sovereign as a nation; it's as simple as that… If we believe in that, then we need to have governments… implement [the appropriate] policies… Governments can do that; if they have the political will and courage, they can make it easier for people to grow food locally, have markets, supply local markets and restaurant chains with food, and increase the amount of food that's being produced (personal communication, March 30, 2017).

Atamanenko suggests that many federal MPs are willing to support policies that prioritize localizing food production and marketing patterns, and align with proposals made by FSC in both *Resetting the Table* (FSC, 2011a) and the Eat Think Vote campaign (FSC, 2015k). Furthermore, Prime Minister Trudeau's mandate to the Minister of Agriculture in 2015 included specific instructions to prioritize local food in Canadian policymaking. The Minister's mandate includes developing a "food policy that promotes… more healthy, high-quality food, produced by Canadian ranchers and farmers, on the tables of families across the country" (Trudeau, 2015). This mandate provides clear evidence that policymakers in the highest office value the idea of promoting Canadian produced food in Canadian markets. Food sovereignty actors believe these types of policy choices will result in increased autonomy for small-scale farmers in Canada through regulations that increase local market opportunities for Canadian farmers and reduce competition from foreign products.

Ideas about farmer autonomy through localizing food systems also align with the multi-functionality paradigm, as federal support for local farmers extends to multiple functions that local farmers provide to rural Canadian society. Previous applications of the multi-functionality

paradigm in Canada (e.g. attention to environmental sustainability and rural interests in the AFP) reflect the value that Canadian policymakers place on family farming as an environmental service and cultural practice, and the contribution of viable family farms to rural community development. Food sovereignty actors connect local food initiatives with broader social goals, resonating with community development goals associated with multi-functionality. Amanda Wilson – a Postdoctoral Fellow working with FSC – explains,

> I think that one of the reasons why local is important is not because it's 'local,' but because when things are local it heightens opportunities for collaboration, for participation, for things to be more community oriented just because geographical proximity enables that to happen (personal communication, March 21, 2017).

According to Wilson, local patterns of food production and consumption are important particularly for the ways that they facilitate collaboration and community engagement, which contribute to valuable social ideals. FSC also emphasized multi-functionality explicitly in the Eat Think Vote campaign, stating "agriculture in Canada needs policies reoriented towards multi-functionality in order to maximize the social and environmental benefits of vibrant rural communities" (FSC, 2015k). By promoting policies of multi-functionality FSC seeks not only to improve the livelihoods and social well being of rural-dwelling Canadians, but also to promote their autonomy and ability to continue living in rural areas, without considerable dependency on external resources.

The alignment of food sovereignty actors' ideas about autonomy in rural communities with the policy paradigm of multi-functionality enables food sovereignty to gain reception with federal policymakers that share the multi-functionality lens. The NDP in particular tend to approach agri-food policy from the multi-functionality perspective, as Atamanenko explained the NDP's 'comprehensive' approach to national food policy in Canada. Atamanenko states,

> by strengthening our overall food supply and supporting farmers, we strengthen our rural communities… whether it be keeping schools open, ensuring that there's good medical services, ensuring that agriculture supply businesses stay open, [or ensuring] that people are able to live in a small community and they don't have to move to a larger centre…. Agriculture plays a pretty important role in that… There are different ways that each level of government can work to support initiatives, to support Food Secure Canada, to support local groups who want to ensure that their restaurants have locally grown food… So that then becomes comprehensive (personal communication, March 30, 2017).

This shows that federal political parties, such as the NDP, apply ideas about supporting local agriculture in their own policy proposals. From a multi-functionality perspective, the success of local farmers is connected with the success of rural communities in general (in terms of vibrant schools and functional social services). For food sovereignty actors, this alignment of ideas between farmer autonomy and federal policy paradigms of both state assistance and multi-functionality creates opportunities to influence federal policymakers by advocating for ideas that are part of existing policymaking frameworks.

Farmer autonomy and intellectual property rights

Next, I discuss how the NFU engaged with policymaking processes surrounding the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) in order to advance ideas about farmer autonomy in Canada. The NFU had numerous qualms with the Agricultural Growth Act; however, their primary concerns involved proposed amendments to the Plant Breeders Rights Act (PBR) – a piece of Canadian intellectual property legislation – to align the PBR with the international protocol UPOV 91 (NFU, 2015a).[18] Ultimately, the NFU and its members feared that these changes would limit Canadian farmers' access to and autonomy over their primary means of production – seeds.

---

[18] This issue and the relevant pieces of legislation are introduced in more detail on pages 46-47 of this thesis.

The NFU presented their analysis to policymakers in multiple forums, suggesting that UPOV 91's additional intellectual property rights protections for plant breeders would limit farmers' self-sufficiency while placing farmers at an increased disadvantage compared with already-powerful agri-food corporations. In a written policy brief, submitted to both the Senate and House of Commons Standing Committees on Agriculture, the NFU claims that

> the 'Agricultural Growth Act' …should not be passed because it would increase farmers' costs, reduce farmers' autonomy and compromise Canadian sovereignty while providing substantially increased revenue and more power and control to multi-national agri-business corporations (NFU, 2015a).

The NFU argued that adopting UPOV 91 would limit farmers' autonomy over seeds in several specific ways. In a presentation to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food (HCSCAAF), the NFU argued that under UPOV 91, farmers would have to enter into contractual arrangements with seed companies to purchase seed (NFU, 2015a). Under UPOV 91, these contracts would give seed companies several exclusive rights, which were not restricted in the past. Specifically, NFU spokesperson and former president, Terry Boehm, stated in his presentation to the HCSCAAF, "the breeder is given an extensive list of exclusive rights: saving, reusing, stocking, conditioning, etc." (NFU, 2015a; NFU, 2014d). Farmers within the NFU took particular issue with these sudden and extensive limitations. In exception to exclusive IP rights, UPOV 91 contains an option called "farmers' privilege," which outlines farmers' rights to some of these activities, such as saving and reusing seeds (CFIA, 2015b; NFU, 2014d). The NFU, however, considered this exemption practically useless, since farmers' privilege did not include the right to store the seed on their property, making it impossible to keep seed for reuse the next year (NFU, 2014b). Then NFU Vice President Policy, Ann Slater, recalls the critical debate to

> mak[e] sure that the farmers' privilege actually allows you to stock seed. In the original writing, farmers could save and replant seed on their own farm, but

> they couldn't stock or condition it, which means they couldn't store it for the next year. It was a huge loophole that could have been used against farmers (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

In this respect, the NFU felt that the spirit of farmers' privilege – to give farmers the autonomy to maintain their traditional farming methods – was not reflected in the details of the legislation (NFU, 2014c). Ultimately, the federal government amended Bill C-18 to include stocking in the set of exempted activities from plant breeders' list of exclusive rights (NFU, 2015b, Parliament of Canada, 2015a).

In addition to concerns about specific seed saving protocols, the NFU claimed that increased IP rights would impact the autonomy of Canadian farmers by obligating farmers to purchase seeds directly from the breeding companies year after year, adding significant input costs to their already-steep operating budgets (NFU, 2015a). Furthermore, the Act limited farmers' ability to sell seed to their neighbours, creating a monopoly environment in the Canadian seed marketplace (NFU, 2015b; A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017). This was problematic for the NFU in several respects. Not only would farmers potentially lose a portion of their business by not selling excess seeds, but also the monopoly-dominated seed markets would have no incentive to maintain affordable seed prices. According to the NFU, the result would be a net loss of income and increased expense for farmers (NFU, 2014c; NFU, 2015b; A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Food sovereignty actors view seeds as an integral element to food sovereignty and autonomy as seeds are a foundational input for agricultural production. Food sovereignty actors claim that a few large seed companies increasingly control seed resources, and food sovereignty actors oppose this corporate consolidation of seeds and plant breeding rights. Lauren Baker – a member of FSC's Steering Committee – claims, "the [international] institutions that have been set up to govern seed policy and genetic resources are deeply favourable to seed as genetic resource for

breeding profit, versus farmers' rights" (personal communication, March 23, 2017). The passing of the Agricultural Growth Act aligned Canadian legislation with these international institutions. According to Baker, granting exclusive breeding rights to a few powerful actors in the Canadian agri-food sector creates an imbalance of power and autonomy. Baker states,

> seeds are the foundation of our food system, and essential to the future of food… So to have a context where very few players have rights over genetic resources, and many players – who have been nurturing that diversity as a dynamic, place-based, culturally specific and contextualized [resource] – have basically no rights is highly asymmetrical (personal communication, March 23, 2017).

The asymmetry that Baker notes between corporations' breeding rights and farmers' autonomy to practice seed-saving in Canada reflects Canadian food sovereignty actors' broader concern with the influence of market liberal ideas in Canadian agri-food policy. For the Canadian government, adopting UPOV 91 was seen as a positive market-opening venture for the Canadian agri-food sector (CFIA, 2015a). However, the NFU viewed this market liberal influence as a direct threat to individual farmers' autonomy (NFU, 2014c).

I suggest that in the case of the Agricultural Growth Act, food sovereignty actors' ideas about farmer autonomy align with longstanding policy ideas associated with state assistance, such as public seed breeding programs. Historically in Canada, developing new plant varieties was a public service, carried out by the ministry of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). Under previous legislation the IP rights for public seed varieties enabled Canadian businesses and farmers to buy and sell seeds, and royalties were understood to finance continued public breeding developments through AAFC. Furthermore previous IP legislation enabled Canadian farmers to adapt seeds on their farms by saving and reusing their most productive seed on the same land, as well as trading with their neighbours over multiple generations (A. Slater, personal communication, March 27, 2017). In this way, government mandated public breeding programs

offered farmers the autonomy to develop and share localized seed varieties without entering into complicated contractual agreements with breeders.

The NFU gained support for its position by encouraging other farm organizations to consider the costs and potential risks of expanding market liberal principles into Canadian seed policy. As a result, according to Allen, the NFU's Save Our Seed campaign caught the attention of larger farmers' organizations, which may have contributed to the governments' amendment regarding the farmers' privilege clause within the Agricultural Growth Act. Allen states,

> [the NFU's campaign] made farmers who were certainly pro [UPOV 91] take notice… It made them ask questions that they had to get answers to…[By raising questions, the NFU] were able to reach beyond just their resources in this case and actually have a greater influence… [because] every farmer needs seeds… So I think they were all in that boat together (personal communication, April 24, 2017).

According to Allen, the universality of farmers' need for seed became a unifying issue for Canadian farmers with respect to Bill C-18. While the amendment to farmers' privilege was considered to be a relatively small victory for the NFU, Allen suggests that the NFU played a significant role in generating discussion and second thought towards the market-opening aspects of Bill C-18 among a wide range of agri-food stakeholders and policymakers. The NFU prompted the federal government to defend its position on increasing Canadian market access to multinational seed companies, and explain to Canadian farmers how the government intended to protect Canadians' best interest in light of market liberal advancements. This advocacy work on the part of the NFU highlights not only food sovereignty actors' views about state assistance in Canada, but also the persistence of the state assistance framework among a broader spectrum of Canadian food producers.

Food Sovereignty Idea #2: Public Engagement in Agri-Food Policymaking

In this section, I present document and interview evidence from the case of national food policy debates to show how food sovereignty actors are advancing ideas about public engagement in agri-food policymaking processes in Canada. I explain how food sovereignty actors advocate for increased representation of civil society in agri-food policymaking processes in light of existing power dynamics in Canadian policymaking. I explain how food sovereignty actors seek to increase their influence in federal agri-food policymaking by advocating for the federal government to take an active role in balancing the interests of civil society with competing interests of agri-food industry stakeholders.

In FSC's national food policy campaigns, FSC proposes that the federal government establish a *national food policy council* for Canada. The idea of creating such a new institution has been raised repeatedly with politicians and government officials through both written correspondence and meetings, such as the candidates meetings held during Eat Think Vote (FSC, 2015f; Bronson, 2015).

The idea for a national food policy council is to establish a formal body where representatives from different areas of the agri-food sector – including civil society, along with farmer organizations and the private sector – meet with the federal government to discuss and monitor agri-food policy issues. Amanda Wilson, a Postdoctoral Fellow working with Food Secure Canada, explains that the proposal for a national food policy council draws on the model of established municipal councils across Canada, such as the Toronto Food Policy Council (personal communication, March 21, 2017). Based on these model institutions, FSC and its members developed a detailed proposal for an advisory council where civil society members would be formally consulted alongside industry and other major stakeholders (FSC, 2015f; FSC, n.d.-a; FSC, n.d.-b). In this way, a national food policy council would constitute "a multi-

stakeholder council that is tasked with ensuring the implementation [of a national food policy], updating it, [and] providing ongoing consultations around it" (A. Wilson, personal communication, March 21, 2017).

To promote the idea of public engagement via civil society representation in agri-food policymaking, FSC developed a proposal for a 'National Food Policy Council of Canada Act' (FSC, n.d.-b). Mirroring the visual style of official federal Canadian legislation, this document defines the key members, structure, functions, and procedures of the proposed food policy council. Specifically, the proposed food policy council would have the mandate to: "undertake research and gather information and analyses on critical issues of food policy; consult with government departments, industry, civil society, and other stakeholders on current priorities and events; [and] make food-policy recommendations directly to policy-makers and through the production of reports" (FSC, n.d.-b, p. 2). In addition to outlining the specific mandate, powers, and representative structure of the council, the proposal also includes specific terms by which members would be remunerated for the expenses incurred to participate on the council. As I will discuss below, FSC considers financial remuneration to be of critical importance in overcoming barriers to civil society's participation in policymaking activities.

In contrast, industry stakeholders have historically been very active in Canadian federal agri-food policy discussions (Skogstad, 2008b). In this research, multiple sources suggest that large agri-businesses have a considerable position of power and influence in Canadian policymaking processes through a well-resourced and highly strategic lobby group.

Former NDP Agriculture Critic, Alex Atamanenko, recalls that representatives from agri-food corporations would place great pressure on MPs to support various policies that were in the corporations' best interest, such as free trade agreements, and oppose bills that would limit the introduction of new agri-food products, such as genetically modified crops (personal

communication, March 30, 2017). In this sense corporate lobbies represent some of the strongest advocates for market liberal policy decisions in Canada. Atamanenko further explained that the power of the corporate lobby is increased when top officials within the federal government agree with market liberal principles as well.

> In my opinion there is tremendous pressure by agribusiness… [and] I think… the governments that we've had in power lately… believe in that philosophy; they believe in free trade… And of course corporations [continue] in their lobbying and meetings. Just as a regular MP on a daily basis I'd have maybe 4 or 5 requests for meetings... And I wasn't even a minister (A. Atamanenko, personal communication, March 30, 2017).

Regular requests for meetings with Members of Parliament is just one strategy employed by corporate lobbyists. Malcolm Allen, who succeeded Atamanenko as the Official Opposition Agriculture Critic for the NDP, recalled that corporations also had access to restricted negotiation circles where international trade agreements are drafted (M. Allen, personal communication, April 24, 2017).

Canadian food sovereignty actors are wary of the significant influence of corporate agri-businesses among various policymaking stakeholders in Canada, including politicians and other farmer organizations. Several interviewees from FSC expressed concern that corporate interests might coopt the process of developing a national food policy in Canada (A. Wilson, personal communication, March 21, 2017; L. Baker, personal communication, March 23, 2017; K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). Likewise, former NFU Vice President Policy, Ann Slater, suggests that large corporations have considerable influence among conventional farmers, including most farmers unions in Canada outside the NFU. Slater states,

> there is tremendous power and push from the big multinational corporate agriculture… they have huge money and huge power. They're able to push their influence in other farm organizations [outside the NFU]… It's very

> different who the sponsors are of [NFU] conventions to who the sponsors are of other agricultural organizations (personal communication, March 27, 2017).

Such wide reaching influence among various agri-food policy stakeholders provides corporations with considerable power to shape the content of policies before they arrive in the Canadian Parliament, where MPs vote to either accept or reject the agreement as written (M. Allen, personal communication, April 24, 2017).

Food sovereignty actors in Canada suggest that governments have the authority and resources to enable meaningful civil society participation in federal agri-food policymaking, and to equalize power dynamics between various agri-food stakeholders. These ideas about public participation align FSC with central ideas within the policy paradigm of state assistance. For example, FSC's proposal for a food policy council would establish a common venue for civil society and industry stakeholders to meet with policymakers and advise policy decisions. In many respects, FSC's food policy council proposal mirrors several other historical democratic institutions under the state assistance paradigm. For example, the Canadian Wheat Board was – until its restructuring in 2011 – a longstanding Canadian institution that incorporated farmers directly in decision-making within a government managed agri-food sector. Canadian farmers also have considerable representation in current institutions responsible Canada's supply-managed sectors.

Existing democratic institutions, such as federal supply management boards associated with the state assistance paradigm in Canada, already consult with stakeholder groups including producers, processors, and Canadian provinces. The key difference between these existing institutions and FSC's proposed food policy council would be the opening up of consultations to include explicit representation (and resources to support participation) of civil society groups. Additionally, food sovereignty actors' ideas about increasing the federal government's public engagement efforts add a unique nuance to discussions of policy paradigms for agri-food policy

in Canada. While the policy paradigm literature does not comment on the democratic mechanisms for *how* governments intervene in the agri-food sector, food sovereignty actors have strong views about how governments should engage with society. In particular, FSC proposes that the government should act as a facilitator in managing a democratic process and equalizing power relations between various civil society and agri-food industry stakeholders. Baker suggests that government leadership is key to successfully developing a national food policy in Canada precisely because of the diversity represented in the Canadian agri-food sector (personal communication, March 23, 2017). Baker states that when each group advocates for its own interests separately, no stakeholder's national food policy proposal has been considered to be viable on its own. According to Baker, "none of [the food policy proposals] went anywhere, because there was no government leadership. None of them were seen as inclusive. None of them were seen to be reflective of all the stakeholders" (personal communication, March 23, 2017). Rather, FSC considers the role of the federal government in Canada to be one of negotiation and regulation among disparate agri-food stakeholders.

There is evidence that the Canadian federal government could be receptive to formalizing a role for civil society in federal agri-food policymaking. MPs from both the Liberal Party and the NDP agree that there is a "fundamental role that the not-for-profit sector and civil society play in both [food] policy development and program delivery" (Liberal Party in FSC, 2015g; FSC, 2015d; FSC, 2015e). Furthermore, the current Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food's direct mandate from Prime Minister's Office to generate a national food policy (Trudeau, 2015), demonstrates an openness on behalf of the government to engage with FSC and continue to work towards a national food policy.

Malcolm Allen, former NDP Official Opposition Agriculture Critic, agrees that civil society has a key role in agri-food policymaking; however, he also highlights a major dilemma for groups

like FSC in finding the resources to enable full participation, even if the opportunity were available. Allen states, the not-for-profit sector "does [have a role in policymaking] and it can, with the resources that it has, try to influence policy. The dilemma is, it usually doesn't have the resources that the others do…" (personal communication, April 24, 2017). Importantly for FSC, the proposed national food policy council would provide both a formal opportunity to access decision-making spaces, and the resources to support civil society organizations to participate in policymaking processes. Wilson notes that including financial resources for certain groups to participate is the major distinction between established municipal models and the proposed national food policy council. Wilson states, "the spirit of [a national food policy council] is certainly the same" as regional food policy councils; however, FSC emphasizes the need to have "some financial resources attached to it… [to] ensure that its members can meaningfully participate, and that it has the authority… to actually inform and influence [government] in important ways" (A. Wilson, personal communication, March 21, 2017). FSC proposes that this could include remuneration for travel expenses and as well as compensation for the time that representatives spend attending council meetings. Without such compensation, Wilson suggests that it is not possible for many civil society workers across the country to travel or participate in policymaking processes in Ottawa (personal communication, March 21, 2017).

Despite limited resources, Baker – a member of FSC's Steering Committee – suggests that FSC's power in Canadian policymaking is strongly connected to its representation of a highly diverse membership. FSC's members extend across Canadian geography and demographics, and their concerns have considerable public attention. According to Baker, this allows FSC to function as a 'new constituency' in Canadian policymaking, gaining credibility with the federal government as a direct result. In Baker's view, the government takes the advocacy work of FSC seriously because its broad-based members function as

> a public constituency that FSC represents. Constituents are people who vote. I think the government cares about that. I think that's one reason. FSC has a network of probably tens of thousands of people who care about food. I also think there's something [to how] this food [discussion] is public. It has a lot of public attention right now… So Food Secure Canada represents the people who are doing that work and pushing that forward… [and] the federal government really cares… (personal communication, March 23, 2017).

By representing a broad range of Canadians in a democratic policymaking environment, food sovereignty actors in Canada are able to generate a degree of power and influence within federal agri-food policymaking processes.

Another key challenge for food sovereignty actors in working with federal governments is highlighted by McKay et al., who claim that national food sovereignty policies might compromise the core principles of food sovereignty by shifting the focus of food sovereignty from empowering individuals to states (2014). This means that as Canadian food sovereignty actors seek to leverage government authority to equalize power dynamics between civil society and powerful multinational corporations, they shift the focus of their advocacy from promoting individual autonomy towards state autonomy to address key agri-food issues. As a result, the relationship between civil society and the state requires a considerable degree of trust as food sovereignty actors rely on governments to deliver policies that are in the best interest of civil society (K. Gibson, personal communication, March 14, 2017). From a food sovereignty perspective, a national food policy council could alleviate this tension by institutionalizing a mechanism for equalizing power dynamics in agri-food policymaking.

Despite these challenges, FSC suggests that the process of public engagement is a central objective in promoting food sovereignty in Canada. For FSC, whose mandate includes facilitating both 'bottom-up' community-based and 'top-down' policy solutions to food-related problems, public engagement in federal policymaking serves two purposes. By engaging with

and representing civil society in federal agri-food policymaking, they hope to create more social awareness and change in individual behaviour concerning key food issues, while also seeking to harness this public awareness to influence the policies that govern agri-food systems in Canada. FSC is committed to this ideal as a long-term objective, even when the direct link between public engagement and policy change is not directly visible. According to Wilson – a Postdoctoral Fellow working with FSC – the goals of directly enabling public engagement in policymaking and influencing actual policy change are both independently valuable, and mutually supportive. Wilson states,

> engaging in public dialogue and having those conversations, that as a process is an objective. I think if Food Secure Canada was strictly concerned about advancing policy, doing all of these campaigns and public engagement activities doesn't always have direct policy outcomes; but I think we, like the NFU… do them because there's a fundamental belief in the importance of doing that… Policy change goes hand in hand with societal change… For meaningful long term, transformational social change, those need to be hand in hand (A. Wilson, personal communication, March 21, 2017).

Several representatives from FSC indicated that adapting federal policymaking institutions and processes to be more inclusive of a broader range of stakeholders is the most important policymaking outcome for food sovereignty in Canada. According Wilson, increased participation in agri-food policymaking is critical since FSC's collaborative "process… is the value-added that food sovereignty brings to the [national food policy] conversation" (personal communication, March 21, 2017). Likewise, Baker explained that even if the outcome of a participatory process contradicts some of the goals usually associated with food sovereignty, ultimately arriving at policy decisions using an inclusive and participatory process is the most important goal in FSC's national food policy consultations (personal communication, March 23, 2017). Wilson expressed similar views, suggesting that the ultimate goal of food sovereignty in Canada is not to promote a specific solution to food-related problems, but rather to create the

conditions where people can freely make choices and influence decisions about how food is produced and distributed in Canada. Wilson claims,

> the struggle [for food sovereignty] is not about a particular vision of what society could be. The struggle is the right and the space to have that conversation about what society could be. It's not about food sovereignty as this specific vision of utopia, it's about having the type of society and reality and equality of power where people are in a position where they can actually enact the kind of food system they want to see (personal communication, March 21, 2017).

In this way, food sovereignty actors' central vision for Canadian policymaking rests in the ideas of increasing representation of non-traditional civil society actors and enabling increased public participation within federal agri-food policymaking processes.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I explained how food sovereignty actors advance key ideas about autonomy and public participation in Canadian agri-food policymaking. Drawing on two case studies – debates over a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) – I have shown how food sovereignty actors seek to advance their ideas about farmer autonomy to influence policy decisions over key issues, such as supports for family farmers and restrictions on IP rights for international plant breeding companies; I argue that these selected ideas and issues align with the established policy paradigms of state assistance and multi-functionality, generating support for food sovereignty in federal policymaking. Additionally, I have explained how food sovereignty actors advocate for increased public participation in Canadian agri-food policymaking, such as the introduction of a national food policy council, encouraging the federal government to take an active role in balancing policy interests between various agri-food policy stakeholders. I suggest this notion builds on existing federal policies and institutions associated with the state assistance paradigm.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

"One result [of the People's Food Policy Project]… was the realization… that food sovereignty is both a goal and a process for achieving that goal"
(Kneen, 2012).

Cathleen Kneen, a central leader in Food Secure Canada (FSC), observed that the process of adapting the food sovereignty concept from the transnational social movement context into the context of Canadian agri-food policymaking generated an understanding of food sovereignty as both "a goal and a process for achieving that goal" (Kneen, 2012). In other words, food sovereignty in Canada involves both 1) ideas about key agri-food policymaking goals, and 2) ideas about how to engage with agri-food policymaking in order to realize those goals. The findings of this research support Kneen's observation, as I have identified and explained food sovereignty actors' key ideas and goals for Canadian agri-food policymaking as well as their targeted policymaking engagement strategies.

Engagement Strategies in Agri-Food Policymaking

I have provided a detailed analysis of food sovereignty actors' strategies of policy engagement in federal agri-food policymaking processes. In both case studies – debates over a national food policy for Canada and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18) – food sovereignty actors engaged in wide reaching campaign projects to facilitate public dialogue and public engagement with key agri-food policymaking processes. In the case of national food policy debates, FSC's advocacy work intentionally coincided with the federal elections of 2011 and 2015 to insert food sovereignty ideas into policy debates during the elections. This enabled FSC to act as a broad public constituency during these elections, and FSC coordinated dozens of non-partisan candidate meetings. This case shows that FSC is actively engaging with federal agri-food policymakers at pivotal moments in the federal policymaking process. One interesting development is that following the 2015 campaign the federal government issued a mandate to

develop Canada's first National Food Policy. Although beyond the scope of this study, current events suggest that FSC continues to be actively engaged in the ongoing National Food Policy consultations led by the Canadian Minister of Agriculture.

The National Farmers Union (NFU) also generated a national campaign to oppose changes to intellectual property rights among other legislative amendments within the Agricultural Growth Act. Like FSC's campaigns, the NFU's activities also sought to mobilize Canadians – including both farmers and civil society – to engage directly with their respective Members of Parliament (MPs). The NFU did this primarily by providing easy to understand explanations of the bill and its implications for Canadian farmers. The NFU also provided resources, such as petitions that people could sign or distribute and post-cards that individuals could send to MPs to express opposition to the bill. In this case, the NFU was successful in influencing a key amendment to Bill C-18, extending "farmers' privilege" to include the right to stock seed – an important aspect of saving and reusing farm-saved-seed.

Importantly for both cases, food sovereignty actors also engaged with policymaking by developing strategic alliances with powerful agri-food policymaking stakeholders, including Members of Parliament and industry leaders. The selective alliances have been developed through multiple meetings and consultation activities over a long period of time. As a result of these alliances, both the NFU and FSC were invited by MPs to provide expert witness testimony to parliamentary standing committees for the House of Commons and the Senate during debate about the Agricultural Growth Act. These invitations to engage in the formal institutions of Canadian agri-food policymaking indicate that food sovereignty actors are recognized by elected officials as legitimate stakeholders and participants in the policymaking process.

Food Sovereignty Ideas in Agri-Food Policymaking

In this research I showed that food sovereignty actors focus their policy engagement on advancing key food sovereignty ideas about autonomy of Canadian farmers as well as expanding public participation in Canadian agri-food policymaking. With respect to autonomy, food sovereignty actors advance their ideas by targeting key policy issues, and these are associated with established policy paradigms of state assistance and multi-functionality. By advocating for policy changes to address rising farm debts, overcome barriers-to-entry for new farmers, increase local food production and distribution patterns, and limit intellectual property rights for large seed companies operating in Canada, food sovereignty actors' advocacy corresponds with the pre-existing policy positions of influential policy actors such as political parties. As a result of such selective advocacy and issue alignment, food sovereignty actors can more easily form alliances with federal policymakers who look favourably on government intervention and management of the agri-food sector. This creates opportunities for food sovereignty actors to advance ideas in the policymaking debates about government support for policies that favour autonomy of small-scale producers in Canada.

Food sovereignty actors also advance ideas about opening up public participation in agri-food policymaking. In particular, FSC has proposed a new institution, a national food policy council, which would serve as a representative advisory body on national agri-food policy issues. The proposal for a food policy council bares similarities to other representative institutions in Canadian agri-food policymaking, characteristic of the state assistance paradigm. The key difference between FSC's proposed food policy council and previous institutional arrangements would be the presence of representatives from civil society. Since civil society has typically not been included in formal agri-food policymaking institutions in Canada, this proposed institution seeks to reset the terms of food sovereignty actors' access to federal policymaking processes. Food sovereignty actors' ideas about public engagement and participation in agri-food

policymaking also bring the issue of power asymmetries among established policymaking stakeholders, including farmers groups, agri-food industry stakeholders, and federal policymakers, to the forefront of policy debates. Food sovereignty actors advocate for the federal government to take an active role in balancing power between these disparate policy actors. In this way, they are introducing core ideas from the transnational food sovereignty movement – about decentralizing power over food and agriculture – into Canadian federal policymaking institutions.

Contributions, Limitations, and Next Steps

This research contributes novel insights to both the social movement literature on food sovereignty actors in Canada, and the public policy literature on the role of ideas in agri-food policymaking in Canada. With respect to the public policy literature, I have demonstrated that national food sovereignty actors, such as Food Secure Canada, are new participants in federal policymaking processes. This is an important development with respect to existing accounts in the literature about who seeks to influence and create agri-food policy in Canada. Furthermore, I show that food sovereignty actors' ideas align in multiple respects with the existing policy paradigms of state assistance and multi-functionality, and that this alignment enables food sovereignty actors to generate support for food sovereignty ideas among sympathetic federal policymakers and other potential allies. That food sovereignty actors are selectively aligning with issues is a significant finding for the literature on food sovereignty. This is because while food sovereignty is generally defined in the literature in terms of its grassroots origins as a social movement concept, this research illustrates how food sovereignty actors are selective when it comes to which food sovereignty ideas they advance in the context of agri-food policymaking in Canada; I suggest that food sovereignty actors have focused their advocacy on food sovereignty ideas that overlap with the established frameworks of state assistance and multi-functionality, which are highly influential in the Canadian context. Furthermore, this helps to illustrate how

food sovereignty actors adapt their ideas and goals in the context of agri-food policymaking in an industrialized country with a highly productive agriculture sector and well-established democratic institutions.

These findings are visible in both case studies – debates over a national food policy and the Agricultural Growth Act (Bill C-18). The similar findings across these two cases suggest that the policymaking ideas and engagement strategies identified in this research might be generalizable to additional cases of food sovereignty actors' engagement in federal policymaking processes. For example, both cases revealed similar insights into the federal policy engagement strategies of national food sovereignty actors when it came to generating public debate and building alliances with Members of Parliament. Furthermore, both cases revealed insights into how food sovereignty proponents advance ideas about farmer autonomy in Canada by targeting key policy issues, such as high debt loads of Canadian farmers, barriers-to-entry for new farmers, and intellectual property rights of large seed-breeding corporations operating in Canada. While national food policy debates provided more detailed data regarding food sovereignty actors ideas on promoting public participation – especially of civil society – in policymaking processes, the efforts to mobilize the public in the NFU's Save Our Seed campaign suggests that ideas about widening public engagement are also relevant in the case of the Agricultural Growth Act.

However, confidence in the generalizability of this research is no doubt limited by the selection of only two case studies. While two cases is a reasonable scope for a Masters research project and sufficient to address my research questions, many other possible cases could reveal additional insights regarding the role of food sovereignty actors and ideas in Canadian federal agri-food policymaking. As a result, this exploratory research opens up multiple avenues for future research. For example, future studies of food sovereignty actors' advocacy in other areas of policymaking, such as the class action lawsuit against the Canadian government regarding the

restructuring of the Canadian Wheat Board, would be a worthwhile additional case study. Furthermore, additional research on comparing the role of food sovereignty actors in Quebec, with those of food sovereignty actors engaged at the national level would shed further light on the relationships between agri-food policymakers and policymaking processes.

This research is also limited by the information that was publically available as well as interviewees' willingness to participate in my study. I interviewed seven people representing FSC, the NFU, and the federal New Democratic Party. However, I could improve the rigor of this research by conducting more interviews and with a broader range of agri-food policy actors, such as representatives from agri-food industry, agri-food policy think tanks, parliamentary staff, and MPs from other federal political parties. Information obtained from interviews with these stakeholders would enable a more detailed explanation of food sovereignty actors' engagement in Canadian federal agri-food policymaking.

Furthermore, this research investigates two of the three key groups of food sovereignty actors identified in the food sovereignty literature. I focused my investigation on FSC as a key consumer group, and the NFU as a key farmers group representing national food sovereignty actors. Missing from this research is an investigation of First Nations groups, and how they are engaging with national agri-food policymaking processes. Recent events, such as FSC's 2016 National Assembly, suggest that Indigenous food sovereignty is a significant component of FSC's ongoing policy work. However, interviews from this research suggest that First Nations food sovereignty actors in Canada are still in the process of discerning if and how they wish to engage directly with federal agri-food policymaking. Future research is therefore needed to understand the nuances of Indigenous food sovereignty in the Canadian context and how First Nations, Inuit, and Métis food sovereignty actors might engage with federal policymaking processes in the future.

Finally, this research identifies only two key ideas that food sovereignty actors are seeking to advance in federal agri-food policymaking spaces – autonomy for farmers, and public participation in policymaking processes. These are not the only ideas that food sovereignty actors advocate, and additional research is necessary in order to identify and explain all the key ideas that emerge as food sovereignty actors continue to engage in policymaking process. In particular, this research identified the human right to food as a key idea in food sovereignty actors' policy engagement, requiring further evidence and detailed investigation.

In conclusion, this exploratory research has shown that food sovereignty actors in Canada are engaging in federal agri-food policymaking and that food sovereignty actors are advancing certain food sovereignty ideas within federal agri-food policy debates. As Canadian food sovereignty actors continue this engagement through ongoing policy developments, including current national food policy consultations, future research is needed to measure and evaluate the actual influence of food sovereignty ideas in national agri-food policymaking in Canada.

Bibliography

Abaidoo, S., & Dickinson, H. (2002). Alternative and Conventional Agricultural Paradigms: Evidence From Farming in Southwest Saskatchewan. *Rural Sociology, 67*(1), 114-131.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada [AAFC]. (2014). "Growing Forward 2." Government of Canada. Retrieved May 26, 2016 from http://www.agr.gc.ca/eng/about-us/key-departmental-initiatives/growing-forward-2/?id=1294780620963

Andrée, P., Cobb, M., Moussa, L., & Norgang, E. (2011). Building Unlikely Alliances Around Food Sovereignty in Canada. *Studies in Political Economy, 88*(Autumn), 133-159.

Baumgartner, F. R. (2013). Ideas and Policy Change. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 26*(2), 239-258.

Beauregard, S. (2009). Food Policy for People: Incorporating Food Sovereignty Principles into State Governance. Case studies of Venezuela, Mali, Ecuador, and Bolivia. (Senior Comprehensive). Urban and Environmental Policy Department, Occidental College, Los Angeles.

Beingessner, N. (2011). Getting to Food Sovereignty: Grassroots Perspectives from the National Farmers Union. Interviews with Terry Boehm and Hilary Moore. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: Creating Just and Sustainable Food Systems*. Winnipeg: Fernwod.

Beuchelt, T. D., & Virchow, D. (2012). Food Sovereignty or the Human Right to Adequate Food: Which Concept Serves Better As International Development Policy for Global Hunger and Poverty Reduction. *Agriculture and Human Values, 29*, 259-273.

Bronson, D. (2015). "National Food Policy." Food Secure Canada. Retrieved July 8, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/2015-12-17_lawrence_macaulay_food_policy_electronic.pdf

Bronson, D., & Mooney, P. (2015). "Bill C-18 Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture." Food Secure Canada. Retrieved July 8, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/default/files/bill_c-18_testimony_senate_0.pdf

Brooks, J. (2014). Policy Coherence and Food Security: The Effects of OECD Countries' Agricultural Policies. *Food Policy, 44*, 88-94.

Béland, D. (2005). Ideas and Social Policy: An Institutional Perspective. *Social Policy and Administration, 39*(1), 1-18.

Byerlee, D., de Janvry, A., & Sadoulet, E. (2009). Agriculture for Development: Toward a New Paradigm. *Annual Review of Resource Economics, 1*, 15-31.

Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute [CAPI]. (2009). "Building Convergence: Towards an Integrated Health and Agri-Food Strategy for Canada." Retrieved April 29, 2016 from http://www.capi-icpa.ca/pdfs/BuildingConvergence_Aug2009.pdf

Canadian Association for Food Studies [CAFS]. (2015). Proceedings from CAFS National Assembly, *Capital Ideas: Nourishing Debates, Minds, and Bodies*. University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation [CBC]. (2011). Canada Needs a Food Policy: Group. *CBC News*. Retrieved June 21, 2017 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-needs-food-policy-group-1.1054649

Canadian Federation of Agriculture [CFA]. (2011). "Towards a National Food Strategy: A framework for securing the future of food." Retrieved May 26, 2016 from http://www.cfa-fca.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/National-Food-Strategy.pdf

Canadian Food Inspection Agency [CFIA]. (2013). "Government proposes changes to support agricultural sector growth through modernization." Government of Canada. Retrieved July 5, 2016 from http://www.inspection.gc.ca/about-the-cfia/newsroom/news-releases/2013-12-09/eng/1386435526001/1386435540960

Canadian Food Inspection Agency [CFIA]. (2015a). "The Impact of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) Conventions on Plant Breeders' Rights in Canada - Questions and Answers." Government of Canada. Retrieved July 5, 2016 from http://www.inspection.gc.ca/plants/plant-breeders-rights/overview/impact-upov/eng/1409072983279/1409073464633

Canadian Food Inspection Agency [CFIA]. (2015b). "Bill C-18: The Agricultural Growth Act." Government of Canada. Retrieved July 4, 2016 from http://inspection.gc.ca/about-the-cfia/acts-and-regulations/regulatory-initiatives/bill-c-18/eng/1424996545350/1424996811411

Candel, J. J. L., Breeman, G. E., Stiller, S. J., & Termeer, C. J. A. M. (2014). Disentangling the consensus frame of food security: The case of the EU Common Agricultural Policy reform debate. *Food Policy, 44*, 47-58.

Cocklin, C., Dibden, J., & Mautner, N. (2006). From Market to Multifunctionality? Land Stewardship in Australia. *The Geographical Journal, 172*(3), 197-205.

Cohn, T. H. (2009). Review of Internationalization and Canadian Agriculture: Policy and Governing Paradigms. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 42*(2), 534-536.

Coleman, W. D. (2001). Agricultural Policy Reform and Policy Convergence: An Actor-Centered Institutionalist Approach. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 3*(2), 219-241.

Coleman, W. D., Skogstad, G. D., & Atkinson, M. M. (1997). Paradigm Shifts and Policy Networks: Cumulative Change in Agriculture. *Journal of Public Policy, 16*(3), 273-301.

Conference Board of Canada. (2014). "From Opportunity to Achievement: Canadian Food Strategy." Retrieved May 3, 2016 from http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=6091

Conservative Party. (2011). *Here for Canada: Stephen Harper's Low Tax Plan for Jobs and Economic Growth*. Ottawa: Conservative Party of Canada. Retrieved from DesLibris: Canadian Electronic Library.

Conservative Party. (2015). *Protect Our Economy: Our Conservative Plan to Protect the Economy*. Ottawa: Conservative Party of Canada. Retrieved May 26, 2016 from http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/2454398/conservative-platform-2015.pdf

Cox, R. H., & Béland, D. (2013). Valence, Policy Ideas, and the Rise of Sustainability. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 26*(2), 307-328.

Daigneault, P. M. (2014). Reassessing the Concept of Policy Paradigm: Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Policy Studies. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(3), 453-469.

de Janvry, A. (2010). *Agriculture for Development: New Paradigm and Options for Success*. Paper presented at the Leonard Elmhirst Lecture: 27th IAAE Triennial Conference, International Convention Center, Beijing, China.

Desmarais, A. A. (2008). The power of peasants: Reflections on the meanings of La Via Campesina. *Journal of Rural Studies, 24*, 138-149.

Desmarais, A. A., & Wittman, H. (2014). Farmers, Foodies, and First Nations: Getting to Food Sovereignty in Canada. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *41*(6), 1-21.

Dibden, J., Potter, C., & Cocklin, C. (2009). Contesting the Neoliberal Project for Agriculture: Productivist and Multifunctional Trajectories in the European Union and Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies, 25*, 299-308.

DurhamRegion. (2015). Ajax, Pickering-Uxbridge federal election candidates discuss food-security. *DurhamRegion*. Retrieved June 23, 2017 from https://www.durhamregion.com/news-story/5953867-ajax-pickering-uxbridge-federal-election-candidates-discuss-food-security/

Edelman, M., Weis, T., Baviskar, A., Borras Jr, S. M., Holt-Giménez, E., Kandiyoti, D., & Wolford, W. (2014). Introduction: Critical perspectives on food sovereignty. *Journal of Peasant Studies, 41*(6), 911-931.

Engler-Stringer, R. (2011). Community Nutrition Practice and Research: Integrating a Food Sovereignty Approach. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: Creating Just and Sustainable Food Systems*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Fairbairn, M. (2010). Framing Resistance: International Food Regimes & the Roots of Food Sovereignty. In H. Wittman, A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO]. (2008). *The State of Food Insecurity in the World*. Rome, Italy: United Nations.

Feindt, P. H. (2010). Policy-Learning and Environmental Policy Integration in the Common Agricultural Policy, 1973-2003. *Public Administration, 88*(2), 296-314.

Flyberrg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. In P. Atkinson & S. Delamont (Eds.), *Sage Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2011a). "Resetting the Table." Retrieved April 17, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resettingthetable

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2011b). "The People's Food Policy Project is Launched." Retrieved April 18, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/blogs-discussions/peoples-food-policy-project-launched

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2012). Proceedings from FSC National Assembly. *Powering up! Food for the Future.* Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, Edmonton, Alberta.

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2014a). "Everybody Eats Launched by Federal NDP." Retrieved Nov 18, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/everybody-eats-launched-federal-ndp

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2014b). "Agriculture Bill (C-18) Will Undermine Canada's Food Sovereignty." Retrieved July 8, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/press-releases/bill-c-18

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2014c). "Webinar: A Seed Act for Farmers Not Corporations." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/content/seed-act-farmers-not-corporations

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2014d). "Update on Bill C-18 and a Call to Action for a New Seed Act for Farmers." Retrieved July 8, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/food-news/update-bill-c-18-and-call-action-new-seed-act-farmers

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2014e). Proceedings from FSC National Assembly. *Waves of Change: Sustainable Food for All.* Marriott Harbourfront Hotel, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015a). "Eat Think Vote Campaign: What We Want." Retrieved June 2, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/what-we-want

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015b). "Bill C-18 The Agricultural Growth Act." Retrieved July 8, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/bill-c-18-agricultural-growth-act

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015c). "The Final Eat Think Vote Numbers Are In." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/final-eat-think-vote-numbers-are-weve-accomplished-great-things-together

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015d). "Federal Elections: 4 Parties are in Favour of a National Food Policy." Retrieved July 8, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/federal-elections-4-parties-are-favour-national-food-policy

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015e). "Sunny Days in Ottawa: Food is Back on the Agenda." Retrieved April 18, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/sunny-days-ottawa-food-back-agenda

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015f). "A National Food Policy Council for Canada." Retrieved April 18, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/national-food-policy-council-canada

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015g). "Food Policy: What to expect from our new government." Retrieved April 17, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/food-policy-what-expect-our-new-government

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015h). "Zero Hunger." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/we-want-canada-zero-hunger

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015i). "A National Healthy School Food Program." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/we-want-national-healthy-school-food-program

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015j). "Affordable Food in the North." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/we-want-affordable-food-north

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015k). "Support for New Farmers." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/resources-news/news-media/we-want-support-new-farmers

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015l). "Eat Think Vote Campaign." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/policy-advocacy/eat-think-vote

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (2015m). "Ensuring All Canadians Enjoy the Right to Food." Retrieved April 28, 2017 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/guaranteed_income.pdf

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (n.d.-a). "More Voices at the Table: The Case for a National Food Policy Council for Canada." Retrieved July 26, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/default/files/files/the_case_for_a_national_food_policy_council_for_canada.pdf

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (n.d.-b). "An Act to establish the National Food Policy Council of Canada." Retrieved July 26, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/default/files/files/national_food_policy_council_of_canada_act.pdf

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (n.d.-c). A People's Food Policy for Canada. Retrieved April 17, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/people-food-policy

Food Secure Canada [FSC]. (n.d.-d). "On Parliament Hill." Retrieved April 17, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/parliament-hill

Global News. (2015a). Going hungry: digesting Canada's food security problem. *Global News*. Retrieved June 21, 2017 from https://globalnews.ca/news/2140806/going-hungry-digesting-canadas-food-security-problem/

Global News. (2015b). Cost of living, economy among most important issues in upcoming election, says new poll. *Global News*. Retrieved June 21, 2017 from https://globalnews.ca/news/2138142/cost-of-living-economy-among-most-important-issues-in-upcoming-election-says-new-poll/

Globe and Mail. (2011). Food Power to the People. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved June 21, 2017 from https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/food-power-to-the-people/article556463/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&

Globe and Mail. (2015). Maple Leaf Food Sustainability Action Committee Hosts Spirited Eat Think Vote Discussion. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved June 23, 2017 from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/news-sources/?mid=cnw.20151007.C3287

Godek, W. (2013). The Complexity of Food Sovereignty Policymaking: The Case of Nicaragua's Law 693. Paper presented at *Food Sovereignty: A Critical Dialogue*. Agrarian Studies Department, Yale University, New Haven.

Hall, P. A. (1993). Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics, 25*(3), 275-296.

Hedley, D. D. (2009). Review of Internationalization and Canadian Agriculture: Policy and Governing Paradigms. *Canadian Public Administration*, Blackwell Publishing.

Hopma, J., & Woods, M. (2014). Political Geographies of 'Food Security' and 'Food Sovereignty. *Geography Compass, 8*(11), 773-784.

Huitema, D., Label, L., & Meijerink, S. (2011). Strategies of Policy Entrepreneurs in Water Transitions Around the World. *Water Policy, 13*, 717-733.

Iles, A., & Montenegro de Wit, M. (2014). Sovereignty at What Scale? An Inquiry into Multiple Dimensions of Food Sovereignty. *Globalizations*.

Josling, T. (2010). Review of Internationalization and Canadian Agriculture: Policy and Governing Paradigms. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 23*(3), 531-545.

Kneen, C. (2011). Food Secure Canada: Where Agriculture, Environment, Health, Food, and Justice Intersect. In H. Wittman, Desmarais, A. A., and Wiebe, N. (Ed.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: Creating Just and Sustainable Food Systems*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Kneen, C. (2012). "The People's Food Policy Project: Introducing Food Sovereignty in Canada." Retrieved July 27, 2016 from https://foodsecurecanada.org/sites/foodsecurecanada.org/files/PFPPforJapan.pdf

Koç, M., MacRae, R., Desjardins, E., & Roberts, W. (2008). Getting Civil About Food: The Interactions Between Civil Society and the State to Advance Sustainable Food Systems in Canada. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, 3*(2-3), 122-144.

La Via Campesina. (n.d.). "The International Peasant's Voice: Globalizing hope, globalizing the struggle." Retrieved September 15, 2017 from https://viacampesina.org/en/international-peasants-voice/

Liberal Party. (2011). *Your Family. Your Future. Your Canada.* Ottawa: Liberal Party of Canada. Retrieved May 26, 2016 from https://www.liberal.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/liberal_platform.pdf

Liberal Party. (2015). *A New Plan for a Strong Middle Class*. Ottawa: Liberal Party of Canada. Retrieved April 4, 2016 from https://www.liberal.ca/files/2015/10/New-plan-for-a-strong-middle-class.pdf

Lilleker, D. G. (2003). Interviewing the Political Elite: Navigating the Potential Minefield.

Politics, 23(3), 207-214.

MacRae, R. (2011). A Joined-Up Food Policy for Canada. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, 6*, 424-457.

Mansfield, B., & Mendes, W. (2013). Municipal Food Strategies and Integrated Approaches to Urban Agriculture: Exploring Three Cases from the Global North. *International Planning Studies, 18*(1), 37-60.

Martin, S. J., & Andrée, P. (2014). From Food Security to Food Sovereignty in Canada: Resistance and Authority in the Context of Neoliberalism. In P. Andrée, J. Ayres, M. J. Mosia, & M. J. Massicotte (Eds.), *Globalization and Food Sovereignty: Global and Local Change in the New Politics of Food*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Martinez-Torres, M. E., & Rosset, P. M. (2010). La Via Campesina: The birth and evolution of a transnational social movement. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 37*(1), 149-175.

McKay, B., Nehring, R., & Walsh-Dilley, M. (2014). The 'state' of food sovereignty in Latin America: political projects and alternative pathways in Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 41*(6), 1175-1200.

McKeon, N. (2009). *The United Nations and Civil Society: Legitimating Global Governance, Whose Voice?* London: ZedBooks.

McMichael, P. (2009). Food Regime Geneology. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36*(1), 139-169.

Mendes, W. (2007). Negotiating a Place for 'Sustainability' Policies in Municipal Planning and Governance: The Role of Scalar Discourses and Practices. *Space and Polity, 11*(1), 95-119.

Metzger, M. (2015). Thinking forward in global food governance - Synthesis paper. *Canadian Food Studies, 2*(2), 345-349.

Ministère d'Agriculture, Pêcheries et Alimentation de Quebec [MAPAQ]. (2013). Une premiere Politique de sauvarainete alimentaire pour le Quebec. Retrieved April 14, 2015 from http://www.mapaq.gouv.qc.ca/fr/Regions/estrie/journal/juin2013/Pages/politiquesouvera.aspx

Moyer, W., & Josling, T. (2002). *Agricultural Policy Reform: Politics and process in the EU and US in the 1990s*. Burlingron: Ashgate.

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2013). "UPOV 91 Again: Seed Saving Under Attack." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/sites/www.nfu.ca/files/UFQ%20-%20UPOV%2091%20Again%20....pdf

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2014a). NFU Brief Regarding Bill C-18 The Agricultural Growth Act. (Submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food). Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/policy/nfu-brief-regarding-bill-c-18-agricultural-growth-act

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2014b). "Questions and Answers about Bill C-18." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/sites/www.nfu.ca/files/QUESTION%20AND%20ANSWERS%20C-18%20FACT%20SHEET_2.pdf

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2014c). "A Corporate Agri-Business Promotion Act: Bill C-18 Backgrounder." Retrieved May 2, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/story/corporate-agri-business-promotion-act-bill-c-18-backgrounder

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2014d). Bill C-18 and Farmers Privilege: What's the Whole Story? Retrieved May 2, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/issue/bill-c-18-and-farmers%E2%80%99-privilege-%E2%80%93-what-whole-story

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2014e). "CETA + Bill C-18 = too much power for seed companies." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/sites/www.nfu.ca/files/CETA%20and%20C-18%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20June%202014.pdf

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2015a). Regarding Bill C-18, the Agricultural Growth Act. (Presentation to the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry) . Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/sites/www.nfu.ca/files/Feb%203,%202015%20-%20Bill%20C-18%20-%20NFU%20Brief%20to%20Senate%20Ag%20Committee_0.pdf

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2015b). "Save Our Seed." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/issues/save-our-seed

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2015c). "Supply Management." Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/policy/supply-management

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (2016). "NFU and La Via Campesina." Retrieved September 17, 2017 from http://www.nfu.ca/about/nfu-and-la-campesina

National Farmers Union [NFU]. (n.d.). Stop Bill C-18. Retrieved July 7, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/issue/stop-bill-c-18

New Democratic Party [NDP]. (2011). *Giving Your Family A Break: Practical First Steps*. Ottawa: New Democratic Party of Canada. Retrieved May 26, 2016 from http://xfer.ndp.ca/2011/2011-Platform/NDP-2011-Platform-En.pdf

New Democratic Party [NDP]. (2014). "Everybody Eats: The NDP Vision for a Pan-Canadian Food Strategy." Retrieved April 7, 2016 from http://malcolmallen.ndp.ca/farm-to-fork

New Democratic Party [NDP]. (2015). *Building the Canada of Our Dreams*. Ottawa: New Democratic Party of Canada. Retrieved May 26, 2016 from http://xfer.ndp.ca/2015/2015-Full-Platform-EN.pdf

Nyéléni. (2007). Declaration of Nyéléni Forum on Food Sovereignty. Retrieved Jan 26, 2015 from http://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290

Oxford. (2010). *Oxford Dictionary* (Vol. 3). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Parliament of Canada. Government Bill. (2015a). *Bill C-18: An Act to Amend Certain Acts Relating to Agriculture and Agri-Food*. 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved May 5, 2016 from http://www.parl.gc.ca/LegisInfo/BillDetails.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&billId=6373658

Parliament of Canada. House of Commons. (2013). House of Commons Debates. *Hansard 147*(33). 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved May 6, 2016 from http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/house/sitting-33/hansard

Parliament of Canada. House of Commons. (2014a). House of Commons Debates. *Hansard 147*(89). 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved May 6, 2016 from http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/house/sitting-89/hansard

Parliament of Canada. House of Commons. (2014b). House of Commons Debates. *Hansard 147*(104). 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved May 5, 2016 from http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-2/house/sitting-104/hansard

Parliament of Canada. Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (2015). *Evidence*. Issue 23. 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved May 10, 2016 from https://sencanada.ca/en/Content/Sen/committee/412/agfo/23ev-51879-e

Petrick, M. (2008). The Co-evolution of Semantics and Policy Paradigms: 50 Years of Europe's Common Agricultural Policy. *Intereconomics,* July/August, p. 246-252. doi:10.1007/s10272-008-0257-8

Potter, C., & Lobley, M. (2004). Agricultural Restructuring and State Assistance: Competing or Complementary Rural Policy Paradigms? *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 6*(1), 3-18.

Potter, C., & Tilzey, M. (2005). Agricultural policy discourses in the European post-Fordist transition: neoliberalism, neomercantilism and multifunctionality. *Progress in Human Geography, 29*(5), 581-600.

Power, E. M. (2008). Conceptualizing Food Security for Aboriginal Peoples in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 99*(2), 95-97.

Princen, S., & Hart, P. (2014). Putting policy paradigms in their place. *Journal of European Public Policy, 21*(3), 470-474.

Qualman, D. (2011). Advancing Agriculture by Destroying Farms? The State of Agriculture in Canada. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: Creating Just and Sustainable Food Systems*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Renting, H., Schermer, M., & Rossi, A. (2012). Building Food Democracy: Exploring Civic Food Networks and Newly Emerging Forms of Food Citizenship. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food, 19*(3), 289-307.

Schiavoni, C. M. (2014). Competing sovereignties, contested processes: The politics of food sovereignty construction. (Working Paper). No. 583. The Netherlands: Institute of Social Studies.

Schiavoni, C. M. (2015). Competing Sovereignties, Contested Processes: Insights from the Venezuelan Food Sovereignty Experiment. *Globalizations*. doi:10.1080/14747731.2015.1005967

Schiff, R. (2008). The Role of Food Policy Councils in Developing Sustainable Food Systems. *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition, 3*(2-3), 206-228.

Shawki, N. (2015). Transnationalism and Diffusion: A Study of the Food Sovereignty Movements in the UK and Canada. *Globalizations*. doi:10.1080/14747731.2015.1012848

Skogstad, G. (1998). Ideas, Paradigms and Institutions: Agricultural Exceptionalism in the European Union and the United States. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration, 11*(4), 463-490.

Skogstad, G. (2007). The Two Faces of Canadian Agriculture in a Post-Staples Economy. *Canadian Political Science Review, 1*(1), 26-41.

Skogstad, G. (2008a). Canadian Agricultural Programs and Paradigms: The Influence of International Trade Agreements and Domestic Factors. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 56*, 493-507.

Skogstad, G. (2008b). *Internationalization and Canadian Agriculture: Policy and Governing Paradigms*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Skogstad, G. (2012). Effecting Paradigm Change in the Canadian Agriculture and Food Sector: Toward a Multifunctionality Paradigm. In R. MacRae & E. Abergel (Eds.), *Health and Sustainability in the Canadian Food System: Advocacy and Opportunity for Civil*

Society. (pp. 17-38). Vancouver: UNBC Press.

Skogstad, G., & Whyte, T. (2015). Authority Contests, Power and Policy Paradigm Change: Explaining Developments in Grain Marketing Policy in Prairie Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science, 48*(1), 79-100.

Slater, A. (2013). "Op Ed: Conference Board Food Strategy Consultation a Smokescreen." National Farmers Union. Retrieved April 11, 2016 from http://www.nfu.ca/story/op-ed-conference-board-food-strategy-consultation-smokescreen

Slomp, J. (n.d.). "Conference Board of Canada's Ideas of Changing Supply Management Are Ill Conceived and Self Serving." National Farmers Union. Retrieved May 2, 2016 from http://foodsecurecanada.org/fr/node/5458

Trudeau, J. (2015). *Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Mandate Letter*. (Letter). Office of the Prime Minister. Retrieved April 11, 2016 from http://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-agriculture-and-agri-food-mandate-letter

Union Paysanne. (2009). "L'Union Paysanne vous informe sur la vrai souveraigneté alimentaire." Retrieved May 13, 2016 from http://archives.unionpaysanne.com/publications/fiches-propositions/souverainete_alimentaire.pdf

Visser, O., Mamonova, N., Spoor, M., & Nikulin, A. (2015). 'Quiet Food Sovereignty' as Food Sovereignty without a Movement? Insights from Post-Socialist Russia. *Globalizations*. doi:10.1080/14747731.2015.1005968

Welsh, J., & MacRae, R. (1998). Food Citizenship and Community Food Security: Lessons from Toronto Canada. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 19*(4), 237-255.

Wiebe, N., & Wipf, K. (2011). Nurturing Food Sovereignty in Canada. In H. Wittman, A. A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty in Canada: Creating Just and Sustainable Food Systems*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Willows, N. D., Veugelers, P., Raine, K., & Kuhle, S. (2008). Prevalence and sociodemographic risk factors related to household food security in Aboriginal peoples in Canada. *Public Health Nutrition, 12*(8), 1150-1156.

Wilson, G. (2007). *Multifunctional Agriculture: A Transition Theory Perspective*. Trowbridge: Cromwell Press.

Wilson, G. (2010). Multifunctional 'quality' and rural community resilience. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 35*(3), 364-381.

Wittman, H., Desmarais, A., & Wiebe, N. (2010). The Origins & Potential of Food Sovereignty.

In H. Wittman, A. Desmarais, & N. Wiebe (Eds.), *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

World Food Programme. (2017). What is food security? Retrieved May 21, 2017 from https://www.wfp.org/node/359289

Yin, R., K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Appendix A

This table identifies the interviewees who agreed to participate in my research, including the organizational affiliation and position of each interviewee. I have also included the date, location, and method of each interview. All identifying information has been reported with full permission of the interviewees and approval of the Research Ethics Board at the University of Northern British Columbia.

Organization	**Title**	**Name**	**Method**	**Date**	**Location**
Food Secure Canada	Steering Committee Member	Lauren Baker	In person	March 23, 2017	Toronto, Ontario
Food Secure Canada	National Food Policy Advisory Committee Member	Kathleen Gibson	Phone	March 14, 2017	N/A
Food Secure Canada	Postdoctoral Fellow	Amanda Wilson	In person	March 21, 2017	Ottawa, Ontario
National Farmers Union	Former Vice President Policy	Ann Slater	In Person	March 27, 2017	St Marys, Ontario
New Democratic Party of Canada	Former Agriculture Critic	Alex Atamanenko	In Person	March 30, 2017	Castlegar, British Columbia
New Democratic Party of Canada	Former Official Opposition Agriculture Critic	Malcolm Allen	Phone	April 24, 2017	N/A
New Democratic Party of Canada	Former Member of Parliament	Megan Leslie	Phone	March 24, 2017	N/A